UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

101 544

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

BY THE SAME AUTHOR

THE IDEA OF NATIONALISM

(New York: Macmillan,, 1944; 5th printing 1952—Spanish translation, Mexico, 1949; German translation, Heidelberg, 1950; Italian translation, Florence, 1956)

PROPHETS AND PEOPLES. STUDIES IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY NATIONALISM

New York: Macmillan, 1946; 3rd printing, 1953—Italian translation, Turin, 1949; German translation, Berne, 1949; Japanese translation, Tokyo, 1954)

THE TWENTIETH CENTURY. A MIDWAY ACCOUNT OF THE WESTERN WORLD

(New York: Macmillan, 1949; 3rd printing, 1953—German translation, Zürich, 1950)

PAN-SLAVISM, ITS HISTORY AND IDEOLOGY

(University of Notre Dame Press, 1953—German translation, Vienna, 1956)

GERMAN HISTORY: SOME NEW GERMAN VIEWS

(London: Allen & Unwin, 1954)

THE MIND OF MODERN RUSSIA: POLITICAL AND SOCIAL THOUGHT IN RUSSIA'S GREAT AGE

(Rutgers University Press, 1955)

MAKING OF THE MODERN FRENCH MIND

(Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1955)

NATIONALISM, ITS MEANING AND HISTORY

(Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, 1955)

NATIONALISM AND LIBERTY

The Swiss Example

HANS KOHN

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
RUSKIN HOUSE
MUSEUM STREET LONDON

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1956

This book is copyright under the Berne convention. Apart from any fair dealing for the purposes of private study, research, criticism or review, as permitted under the Copyright Act, 1911, no portion may be reproduced by any process without written permission. Inquiry should be made to the publisher

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN
in 12-point Bembo type
BY UNWIN BROTHERS LIMITED, WOKING AND LONDON

Two voices are there; one is of the sea,
One of the mountains; each a mighty Voice,
In both from age to age thou didst rejoice,
They were thy chosen music, Liberty!

WILLIAM WORDSWORTH

Im Enthusiasmus für die Freiheit bin ich ganz Britte.
(In my enthusiasm for liberty I am entirely British.)

JOHANNES MÜLLER

God grant that not only the love of liberty, but a thorough knowledge of the rights of man, may pervade all the nations of the earth, so that a philosopher may set his foot anywhere on its surface, and say, 'This is my country.'

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN

INTRODUCTION

THE present essay on the development and character of Switzerland as a nation is part of a larger study on *The Age of Nationalism*, on which I have been working for some time. This essay is published in the hope that it may help to illuminate the significant contribution which an understanding of Swiss nationalism can make to the solution of some of our most bewildering problems. For nationalism has been and continues to be the most potent force influencing the course of modern history. But nationalism is in its nature and in its implications very different in the various countries and at different times. It is an historical phenomenon and thus determined by the political ideas and the social structure of the lands where it takes root. Only a study of the historical growth of nationalism and a comparative analysis of its different forms can make us understand the promise and the peril which nationalism since the nineteenth century has carried and continues to carry for the liberty of man and the maintenance of peace.

In recent times the question, how far nationalism with its emphasis on collective power is compatible with the preservation and expansion of individual liberty and of civil society, has become of increasing urgency. Nationalism was in the eighteenth century in North-Western Europe and in North America a struggle for the assertion of individual rights against state absolutism. In the atmosphere of the Enlightenment, nationalism was a liberal and humanitarian movement in an ever-widening open society. With its spread outside of North-Western Europe, nationalism has tended to a growing degree to stress more and more the exclusiveness of ethnic or linguistic groups and to strengthen their combativeness. Already in the middle of the nineteenth century, in Central Europe German and Italian nationalists claimed that all German- or Italian- speaking people must form part of one German or Italian nation-state. Nationalist passions were aroused to 'redeem' populations not yet included in the nation-state in which their ethnic group or language

predominated. The union of these peoples with their 'natural' or 'true' homeland has become one of the main nationalist demands in the contemporary world. In a darkening world of violence and impatience, the same nationalist passions were often the cause for the weakness of democracy and of humanitarian feelings in countries where the liberal traditions had not taken firm root. There individual liberty and respect for diversity were subordinated to considerations of collective interests and national power. But in one country in the centre of the European continent nationalism took a different development. Though Switzerland is only a small country of very limited natural resources, its kind of nationalism makes it an object of great and general interest at a period when the age of nationalism seems to reach its threatening climax in so many parts of the globe.

Yet Switzerland seems to present great obstacles to the growth of a liberal nationalism. For the inhabitants of Switzerland represent different ethnic groups which have been fighting each other in many wars outside Switzerland, and they speak German, French and Italian—languages of peoples which outside the Swiss borders have in modern times often succumbed to an aggressive nationalism harmful to the liberty of the individual. In none of the three nations has modern democracy been secure. Yet peoples speaking the very same languages and living in Switzerland have developed a democratic nationalism similar to the one known in England and the United States, a nationalism made secure and strong by its insistence on individual liberty and on respect for diversity. The following essay tries to throw some light on how this came about. It inquires into the character and meaning of Swiss nationalism. It may help to answer the question how far the Swiss experience can set an example for the compatibility of nationalism and liberty and for the peaceful and productive coexistence of various ethnic groups in one common state.

Switzerland, however, possibly can also set an example for the growth of unity among the democratic peoples, a unity which today seems urgent and necessary but to which differences of tradition, language and economy appear to present insuperable

obstacles. Switzerland originated in a loose confederation or, rather, a permanent alliance of sovereign and highly differentiated states, different and often opposite in their traditions, economic structure, language and religion. These states had neither a federal constitution nor common executive or legislative organs. Their ties consisted in the recognition of the need for common military action in case of outside aggression and in the feeling of a similar love of liberty and reliance on self-government. Slowly their co-operation in defence of their independence and liberties grew into a true federal union. The various nations which share the traditions of modern Western civilization—an open society based upon respect for individual liberty, the right of diversity and therefore on freedom of thought and tolerance—face today a similar problem: to unite in the defence, and for the strengthening, of their liberties and to develop this defensive alliance into an ever-closer union. These are the reasons why the Swiss example seems to me of significance.

It might be appropriate to express here also my personal appreciation of Switzerland. Since 1921 when I went there for the first time, I have felt at home in Switzerland, more than in any other European continental country. I have spent there many happy weeks and months, but it was, as in the United States, less the beautiful countryside—and both nations excel in natural beauty—than the political and human climate which profoundly impressed me. My thanks go to my Swiss friends, Professor Hans Barth of the University of Zürich, and Nationalrat Willy Bretscher, editor-in-chief of the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, who have in many ways encouraged and helped my essay on Switzerland. But I learned to understand Switzerland and its unique character better after the United States became my home. From my familiarity with Anglo-American nationalism and its deep roots in the liberal English tradition and in the humanitarianism of the Enlightenment, I gained new insights into the character and diversity of nationalism in general and into Swiss nationalism in particular. In the United States, too, my study of nationalism has met with helpful encouragement. Writing this introduction at the Institute

for Advanced Study at Princeton, New Jersey, I wish to tender my thanks to its hospitality and its unique and stimulating atmosphere of free scholarly research. Finally, I wish to thank Mrs. Marion G. Hartz who during my two periods of membership at the Institute has rendered me most valuable and always efficient assistance.

Princeton, New Jersey H. K.

November 1955

CONTENTS

	Introduction	page 7
1	*The Roots of Swiss Liberty*	13
2	*The Roots of Swiss Nationality*	18
3	*Enlightened Patriotism*	28
4	*Swiss Nationality and the French Revolution*	35
5	*The Helvetic Republic*	39
6	*Napoleon and Swiss Nationality*	48
7	*The Restoration in Switzerland*	54
8	*Pestalozzi*	61
9	*The Regeneration of Swiss Nationalism and Liberty*	67
10	*Switzerland as a European Model*	75
11	*Gotthelf and Burckhardt*	78
12	*The Swiss Civil War I*	85
13	*Gottfried Keller : German-Swiss Nationality*	89
14	*The Federal Principle and National Unity*	96
15	*The Swiss Civil War II*	99
16	*The Swiss Glorious Revolution*	104
17	*The Settlement of 1848*	107
18	*The Model of the United States*	111
19	*Switzerland in the Age of Linguistic Nationalism*	115
20	*Switzerland and its Neighbours*	120
21	*Swiss Nationalism in the Two World Wars*	127
	Index	131

— 1 —

THE ROOTS OF SWISS LIBERTY

MODERN political liberty is a late fruit of Western development. On the European continent the French Revolution of 1789 is generally regarded as the source and inspiration of modern liberty. The German philosopher Karl Jaspers in a recent essay on the philosophy of history rejected, however, the French Revolution as the model of true liberty. For the liberty proclaimed by the French Revolution was too deeply moulded by the country's traditions of feudal mentality and absolutist monarchy; for that reason the direct and decisive influence of the French Revolution remained, both in its positive and its negative aspects, confined to countries of a similar social and intellectual structure. In these lands, as in France herself, secure liberty was not established; liberty there remained ever endangered from within. 'In countries with a feudalistic background,' Jaspers wrote, 'the French Revolution has proven an ambiguous phenomenon, because it desired liberty and reason but allowed at the same time for despotism and force. In two different ways the French Revolution has determined our thinking: on the one hand, which is good, it calls us to struggle for the rights of man and the freedom of every individual against the evils of oppression and exploitation; on the other hand, which is wrong, it makes us think that the world as a whole can be established by force on reason alone, instead of on the rational transformation of historical values and order.' To Jaspers modern liberty in its creative fullness and enduring vitality has not been realized in or through the French Revolution but in the continuous growth of a liberal tradition

from historical roots in England and the United States, in Holland and Switzerland.[1]

Even in these countries, however, the French Revolution marked a turning-point: but there, where it met with a non-absolutist past and a broad non-dogmatic approach, its influence was beneficial; it helped to develop or rejuvenate a nationalism compatible with an unshakable respect for individual liberty and local self-government and with a broad tolerance of diversity as an enrichment of national life. The principles themselves which were proclaimed with such sudden splendour and enthusiasm in France in 1789 owed their origin largely to their much slower growth in England, Anglo-America and Switzerland. When they radiated back from France to these countries, they were there slowly and firmly assimilated, stage by stage, into the national traditions and structures: their influence contributed to a fertile and enduring synthesis of the traditional historical liberties with the new concept of universal and rational individual rights. As a result of this development, nations like Switzerland and England showed an unusual degree of cohesion and stability in the revolutionary age of nationalism and at the same time provided a fertile soil for the full growth of individual liberty and of corporate autonomy.[2] In other lands, however, even in France herself, the principles of 1789 have been again and

[1] Karl Jaspers, *Vom Ursprung und Ziel der Geschichte* (Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949), p. 176.

[2] In England and Switzerland 'liberty and self-government had molded the territorial nation, and given content to its communal nationality.' L. B. Namier, *Avenues of History* (New York: Macmillan, 1952), p. 21. 'So close is the nexus between territory and nationality in English law that a child of whatever parentage if born under the British flag can claim British nationality. Indeed, the English language lacks a word to describe a "nationality" distinct from, or contrasted with, the citizenship derived from territory and State; and the meaningless term of "race" is often used for what in Continental languages is covered by "nationality".' Hermann Weilenmann, *Die vielsprachige Schweiz* (Basle: Rhein Verlag, 1925), p. 70, distinguishes three types of nations: nations based on common descent (*Stammesnation*), nations based on common language (*Sprachnation*), and finally nations based on common territory and political community (*Staatsnation*) and declares that Switzerland from the beginning has conformed to the type of territorial nation.

again abandoned in favour of some form of authoritarian nationalism, dedicated either to a haughty rejection of the heritage of eighteenth-century enlightenment or to its absolutist and extremist imposition.

The English people grew into a nation out of the mingling of various racial stocks and of two languages on the strength of a political idea and of a form of organization which they identified with liberty. This process was facilitated by the fact that England is a 'happy island' separated by the sea from Europe. England has known in its centuries of struggle with Scotland and Wales 'a legacy of hate as bitter as any that vexed the peace of continental Europe.' Through the principle of liberty Britain has become a 'close-knit, multi-national state,' where no uniformity is imposed and equal opportunities are given.[1]

Equally remarkable is the achievement of Switzerland. There a people, predominantly of German descent and language, situated in the heart of the European continent, surrounded on all sides by populations with whom they shared the 'natural' ties of descent and mother tongue, a people moreover split by the Reformation into two bitterly antagonistic religious camps, pursued a unique development which distinguished them sharply from the surrounding and closely related Germans, French and Italians. In their pragmatic attitude and in their political principles the Swiss resembled the English and the Anglo-Americans more than their neighbours. 'The genius of the Swiss people,' Carl Hilty wrote, 'which expresses itself in its best periods and men, is a peculiar combination of enthusiasm with a strong practical common sense, a combination which is characteristic of politically gifted peoples.'[2]

[1] See Sir Reginald Coupland, *Welsh and Scottish Nationalism* (London: Collins, 1954).

[2] Swiss eighteenth-century political thinkers like Jean Jacques Burlamazi (1694–1748), the author of the *Principes du Droit Naturel* (1747), and Emeric de Vattel (1714–1767), the author of *Le Droit des Gens, ou Principes de la loi naturelle appliqués à la conduite et aux affaires des nations et des souverains* (1758), rational utilitarians in their synthesis of Christianity and Stoicism, were very widely read in England and the United States.

Originally the Swiss Confederation formed, by descent, language and feeling of belonging, a part of the German Reich. The Swiss called themselves 'Alter grosser Bund in oberdeutschen Landen' (Liga vetus et magna Alamaniae superioris). Though their full independence from the Reich was practically established at the Peace of Basle in 1499 and officially recognized in the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the ruling class in the Confederation continued to feel themselves Germans. Renaissance humanists tried to base an incipient Swiss nationalism on a unity of race and language. The Swiss historian Aegidius Tschudi (1505–1572), a member of an aristocratic family in the canton Glarus and an adversary of the Reformation, differentiated the Swiss from the Germans by their race and from the French by their language. According to his *Gallia comata*, the Swiss descended from the Celtic Helvetians, a heroic mountain race, who had liberated themselves in antiquity from Roman oppression, as they freed themselves centuries later from Austrian domination. A part of the Helvetians, however, had remained in antiquity subjected to the Romans, and as a result they spoke French; rightfully, however, they belonged to the German-Swiss, their happier racial brethren. Thus German-speaking Switzerland formed the core of the nation, but thanks to its Celtic race it was not identical with the Germans.

In the sixteenth century attempts were even made to Germanize French-speaking Switzerland. But at the same time, while the political ties with Germany were completely dissolved, a close political and military friendship developed between Switzerland and France, which lasted until the eighteenth century and found its last expression in the treaty of alliance of 1777. The French kings protected Swiss independence and the Swiss served as allies and mercenaries in the French armies where their fighting spirit, their *furor teutonicus*, was highly appreciated. The Franco-Swiss co-operation brought wealth and cultural progress to the backward Swiss mountaineers. The universal prestige and preponderance of the French language in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries halted and even reversed the brief Germaniza-

tion effort of the Renaissance. As all over Europe, the leading families of the traditionally German-speaking Swiss cities began to use French in their correspondence and conversation; in an age free of nationalism they felt themselves members of a cosmopolitan aristocracy. When, as a result of the French Revolution, nationalism began to play a growing role, the Swiss no longer sought its basis in common descent or language but in common political traditions and institutions. They turned for inspiration to their past struggles for constitutional liberty; like the English who in the seventeenth century, at the time of the birth of their modern nationhood of liberty, traced its origin back to the Magna Carta and the ensuing parliamentary development, reinterpreting them in the spirit of the new time, thus the Swiss looked back to the thirteenth-century origin of their nation, when in a Europe growing more and more subject to feudalism and absolutism free communities of peasants and burghers established and preserved their liberties. England and Switzerland became in the nineteenth-century stable democratic nations to a degree rarely found elsewhere. They owe it partly to the indirect influences of the French Revolution—but even more to the fact that the foundations of their democracy have their roots in the thirteenth century. The revived memory and the glorifying interpretation of those foundations kept the spirit of national cohesion and of human liberty strong amidst all the deep social changes and international tensions of recent times. Even in seventeenth-century Switzerland, at a time of the bitterest religious animosity and of the lowest ebb of the spirit of unity, the cantons pledged their co-operation, in the Defensional of March 8, 1668, for the 'preservation of the glorious liberties which our beloved ancestors so dearly acquired' (erhaltung der von unsern lieben altfordern so theür erworbnen herrlichen freyheiten).

— 2 —

THE ROOTS OF SWISS NATIONALITY

THE Swiss Confederation originated in an alliance for mutual aid concluded by peasants of three Alpine valleys (Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden) against infringements, by secular or ecclesiastical lords, of their hard-won communal self-government and administration of justice. In all its successive growth, the Confederation remained, until the end of the eighteenth century, what it was at the beginning, a loose alliance which disposed neither of an executive authority nor of a legislative body and which possessed neither a common army nor any common laws. The purpose of the pact of Confederation was not the constitution of a new state or of a nation but the creation of a league of nations in order to preserve and protect the independence of the individual and fully sovereign member states or cantons. The three original peasant cantons or *Urkantone* were joined in the fourteenth century by the three city republics of Lucerne, Zürich and Berne. At the end of that century the Confederation consisted of eight cantons or *Orte*; their number grew to thirteen at the beginning of the sixteenth century and then remained stationary for almost three hundred years. Greatest diversity prevailed in the conditions of accession and in the constitutions of these cantons. Each formed a world of its own: nothing united them but the common will to defend their liberties.

The Confederation and the single cantons tried to improve and to protect their position by acquiring, through conquest or purchase, outlying territories of strategic or economic importance and by concluding agreements of military co-operation with neighbouring states. The former were called 'subject' lands (*Untertanenländer*); the latter associated nations (*zugewandte*

Orte). Among these allied territories which had no right to share in the decisions of the Confederation was the city republic of Geneva, which entered in 1584 into an 'eternal alliance' with Berne and Zürich, the three free confederations (*Drei Bünde*) of the Grisons (*Graubünden*), and the Valais, both very loose confederations themselves. Other territories—among them the French-speaking Vaud and the Italian-speaking districts of Lugano and Bellinzona—were outright subject lands, 'colonies' of an individual canton or of a group of cantons, which replaced the former reigning lords. The attitude of the ruling cantons often was haughty and oppressive but it generally respected the local autonomies and traditional forms of self-government. Thus the greatest diversity and unequality prevailed among the various territories, forming the extremely loose structure of the Confederation. But even the individual cantons were in no way uniform or logical in their internal organization. Many cantons represented loose confederations of frequently unequal communities. Though historical liberties were jealously guarded, neither national unity nor democracy characterized Switzerland before the French Revolution.[1]

[1] On the origin of the Confederation see Karl Meyer, *Die Urschweizer Befreiungstradition in ihrer Einheit, Ueberlieferung und Stoffauswahl* (Zürich: Orell, Füssli, 1927), and his 'Der Ursprung der Eidgenossenschaft,' *Zeitschrift fur schweizerische Geschichte* XXI (1941) No. 3. The Confederation owed its origin to a defensive alliance, concluded for the struggle against the Habsburgs in the summer of 1273 and renewed in August 1291, after the death of Rudolf von Habsburg. On the constitutional growth of the Confederation and its transformation, see *Quellenbuch zur Verfassungsgeschichte der Schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft und der Kantone von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. by Hans Nabholz and Paul Kläui (Aarau: Sauerländer, 1940); David Lasserre, *Alliances Confédérales 1291–1815* (Erlenbach-Zürich: Rentsch, 1941); and Zaccaria Giacinetti, *Das Staatsrecht der Schweizerischen Kantone* (Zürich: Polygraphischer Verlag, 1942). The role which the struggle against the Habsburgs played in the formation of the original Confederation, the struggle against the dukes of Savoy played in the accession of French-speaking parts of Switzerland to the Confederation. In the war against Savoy, Berne conquered the Vaud and Lausanne in 1536. 'On ne saurait exagérer l'importance de cette conquête. Elle est comparable à celle du Tessin et la dépasse de beaucoup. Ce fut pour la Confédération une nouvelle naissance. Sans qu'il soit permis de réfaire l'histoire, on peut affirmer que si la Suisse était restée purement allemande, elle n'aurait pas pu defendre son independance contre le mouvement des nationalités modernes qui

In the fifteenth century the Swiss cantons represented a great military power, which participated decisively in the European wars of the period. Their loose alliance, however, was not strong enough to support a great power policy of warfare and expansion; the cantons were not willing to sacrifice their liberties and their independence on the altar of centralization and efficiency. They preferred, as a modern historian puts it, their own way of life, which they regarded as their freedom, to the lures of power.[1] The only outward form of Swiss cohesion until 1798 was the Diet, not an elected parliament representing the nation as in England but a diplomatic congress of delegates sent there by the sovereign cantons. Though each of them had an equal vote at the Diet, the factual inequality between the vast territory and wealth of Berne and the smallness and frugality of the less favoured cantons, several times almost led to a rupture of the Confederation. The original rural cantons distrusted the growing power of the cities. In the fifteenth century their opposition to the admission of Solothurn and Fribourg, Berne's allies, threatened to provoke an armed conflict. A pious man from Unterwalden, Nikolaus von der Flüe (1417–1487), known as the hermit brother Klaus, reconciled the hostile camps and saved the Confederation, a miracle which led to his beatification in 1669 and his canonization in 1947.

Their refusal to follow the example of the rising power-states and to establish a central authority, which alone could have made their continuous participation in armed power conflicts possible, forced the Swiss into a policy of neutrality, which since has become a traditional policy with them. Their loose confederation which was hardly more than a perpetual alliance,

a tendu à la création de grands Etats sur une base linguistique. Au moment où les Bernois ont conquis le Pays de Vaud, il n'ont peut-être pas saisi toute la portée nationale de leur acte, car la diversité des langues n'étonnait alors aucun esprit. Mais la conquête n'en a pas moins régeneré, et peut-être sauvé, la Confédération.' William Martin, *Histoire de la Suisse*. Essai sur la formation d'une Confédération d'états (Lausanne: Payot, 1943) p. 112.

[1] Werner Näf, *Föderalismus und Demokratie in der Schweiz* (Freiburg i.B.: Karl Alber, 1947), p. 11.

was strong enough for defensive purposes; it was too weak to support an active warlike policy. This turn toward neutrality came at a propitious moment for the preservation of Swiss unity. For, when the Reformation split Switzerland into two hostile camps and when the age of the great religious wars began, neutrality proved the only way to keep Swiss unity and independence intact. At the same time the fact that the Swiss cantons stayed out of the religious wars which devastated Europe in the seventeenth century, assured them a high degree of prosperity.[1] During the Thirty Years War, the German author Grimmelshausen described the impression which the hero of his novel, the adventurous soldier Simplicius Simplicissimus, gained on a visit to Switzerland. 'Here in comparison with other German lands the country seemed to me as strange as if I had been in Brazil or China. I saw how the people did trade and traffic in peace, how the stables were full of cattle and the farmyards crowded with fowl, geese, and ducks, the roads were used in safety by travellers, and the inns were full of people making merry. There was no fear of an enemy, no dread of plundering, and no terror of losing goods and life and limb; each man lived under his own vine and fig-tree, and that moreover (in comparison with other German lands) in joy and delight, so that I held this land for an earthly paradise, though by nature it seemed rough as might be.'[2]

In spite of this neutrality, Swiss 'Catholics and Protestants lost all feeling of unity, because they considered first and fore-

[1] The Protestant and the Catholic cantons showed their very decided sympathies with the one or the other of the conflicting religious camps. The Protestant cantons tried in 1653 to reconcile the Protestant republics of Holland and England, and Oliver Cromwell favoured the formation of a Protestant League consisting of England, Holland and Switzerland.

[2] Hans Jakob Christoffel von Grimmelshausen, *Der Abenteuerliche Simplicissimus* (1688) Bk. V, Ch. I, tr. as *Simplicissimus the Vagabond* by A. T. S. Goedrerk (London: Routledge, 1924), p. 304 f. Many friends of the loosely organized old German Reich in the eighteenth century and of the German Confederation in the first half of the nineteenth century supported them for the very reason that, like the Swiss Confederation, they were incapable of aggressive wars but strong enough for self-defence. German lovers of peace feared lest centralized Germany might become an aggressive force in the heart of Europe.

most the preservation and expansion of their faith.'[1] Yet the remarkable stability of Switzerland in an age of bitter religious wars was made possible by the respect for the religious *status quo* which gave to each group a feeling of security and removed the fear of succumbing to the dynamism or expansionism of the other creed. The two faiths were treated as equal irrespective of their numerical strength. The religious peace was also preserved by the sovereignty and seclusion of the cantons, the majority of which would not allow the exercise of any religion but their own on their territory. This strict religious separation was overcome only after 1848 with the establishment of a common federal citizenship which for the first time gave to every Swiss the right to settle permanently everywhere in Switzerland; the ensuing migrations led to an intermingling of Protestants and Catholics in most cantons; in the seventeenth century, however, the religious barriers separating the cantons were much more important than linguistic affinity or the then hardly existing concept of a territorial Swiss nation. The cantons—and not the Confederation—were the fatherland, to which the citizens were bound not only constitutionally but by ties of emotional loyalty based upon religion and love of home.

Only in the eighteenth century, with the coming of the Enlightenment, did the religious ties begin to lose some of their emotional fervour and exclusiveness. In the spirit of the time a new patriotism came slowly into being, based upon the revival of ancient memories of freedom and the unifying tie of constitutional liberty. Switzerland was then in a very sorry state. All political and civic life was centred in the cantons, and even there it was frozen into obsolete forms. The Confederation was as ramshackle and full of historical absurdities as the moribund eighteenth-century German Reich. In a general atmosphere of stagnation, made worse by the smallness of the territories, all

[1] Weilenmann, *op. cit.*, p. 92. During the Thirty Years War the Spanish ambassador told the Catholic cantons: 'You should know that an African or Indian who is a Catholic, is more closely related to you and that you owe him more favours than to a Swiss compatriot who is a heretic.'

political rights were limited to hereditary castes: in the six rural democracies to the old-established peasant families; in some cities like Basle and Zürich to the wealthy guild-masters and merchants; in other cities like Berne and Lucerne to a small patrician aristocracy. The rural populations in the city-cantons, most of the burghers in many cities, and finally whole subject territories were without rights. They were *Untertanen* (subjects) of the *gnädige Herren*, the gracious lords who carefully imitated the aristocratic manners of contemporary France. Old treaties and liberties were disregarded. Uprisings of the oppressed populations were cruelly suppressed and revenged, like in 1755 the revolt of the people of the Valle Leventina south of the St. Gotthard against their 'masters and protectors,' the canton of Uri.

But the intellectual trends of the age, which penetrated to Switzerland from the West, were favourable to an awakening of a Swiss patriotism. In the moral and aesthetic climate of the later eighteenth century, the high mountains and the rough climate were generally regarded as a bulwark of freedom. The life in the rugged and grand nature of the Alps seemed to be bathed in an air of liberty; the people in the remote and 'unspoilt' valleys were supposed to excel by the simplicity of their mores and their republican virtues and thus to be worthy successors of the ancient Romans. Swiss cities were unusually rich in old chronicles which were now diligently studied and which aroused a proud interest in the constitutional liberties of former times. A Bernese officer, Beat Ludwig von Muralt (1665–1749), who had served in France and lived in England, published in 1725 his *Lettres sur les Anglois et les Français*, in which he interpreted English political liberty. Johann Jakob Bodmer (1698–1783) translated Milton who represented to him religious liberty. Bodmer, who taught 'patriotic history and politics' in Zürich, and like-minded citizens of other Swiss cantons dedicated much effort to the editing of the historical chronicles. They were deeply critical of contemporary Switzerland and its lack of patriotic spirit; longingly they looked back to the Puritan simplicity of their ancestors and to the liberties of the past, and found

in them an additional source of their 'modern' inspiration. After all, the Swiss Middle Ages could not be glorified, as the German Middle Ages were by the German romanticists, as the model of an aristocratic society, of chivalry and knighthood: out of the depth of the Swiss thirteenth century the eighteenth-century heirs thought to hear the voice of liberty, conceived by simple peasants and hard-working burghers in their struggle against aristocratic society, a voice resounding in the majesty of glorious undefiled nature herself. At the origin of Swiss history stood an uprising of yeomen against lords and knights, the protection of a free community of men of patriotic devotion, leading a life of simplicity and equality, which found its symbolic embodiment in Wilhelm Tell, the hero of liberty.

At the beginning of the eighteenth century Tell's reputation in official Switzerland was rather low. Many saw in him rather a rebellious murderer than a patriotic hero. The debate whether his deed could be politically or morally justified filled three centuries of Swiss intellectual history. In the eighteenth century two factors combined to make the Tell cult generally acceptable: on the one hand, order seemed so firmly established that the legend of the patron saint of a peasant uprising appeared unable to disturb it; on the other hand, the new Rousseauan enthusiasm glorified Tell not only as a patriotic hero but as a fighter for human rights against tyranny, a worthy successor of Brutus. In his drama *Wilhelm Tell* (Basle, 1777), Joseph Ignaz Zimmerman (1737–1797), a Jesuit father of Lucerne, made Tell say to his wife that he was not only fighting for home and hearth but above all for the rights of man.[1]

The patriotism so widely discussed by the young Swiss generation after the middle of the eighteenth century was still the patriotism of the canton. Patriotism with them meant civic

[1] See Ricco Lebhardt, *Wilhelm Tell als Patriot und Revolutionär, 1700 bis 1800* (Basler Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft, vol. 27, 1947), and Fritz Ernst, *Blätter aus der Ruhmesgeschichte Wilhelm Tells* (Zürich: Fritz Wasmuth, 1936). In France, Tell was popularized by the play *Guillaume Tell* (1766) by Antoine-Marin Lemierre (1723–1793), and his fame grew fast as the French Revolution approached. The French diplomatic agent in Switzerland, Antoine Mengaud (1750–1818), used

virtues and human rights, not national unity. Johann Heinrich Füssli (1745–1832), who became in 1775 Bodmer's successor as professor of patriotic history in Zürich, published in that year a *Catechetische Anleitung zu den politischen Pflichten* (*Catechism of Political Duties*) in which he wrote that a state derives its greatest strength in a war from the fact that 'every citizen is convinced that it is better for him to lose his property and his life than to be deprived of the protection of a state in which he has found his happiness.' This definition of patriotism carried the hallmark of the Age of Enlightenment, the proclamation of man's rights to the pursuit of happiness, and the 'state' in question was for Füssli the canton Zürich, and not Switzerland. He regarded Switzerland purely as an association of independent yet interdependent states, an association formed for the purpose of affording to the individual states collective security, but the members of which were like the members of one body of which none can suffer without all of them suffering. Therefore the citizens of Zürich 'should regard the happiness of their allies as part of their own happiness, should gladly sacrifice some of their own advantages and should be accommodating in those matters which divide us,' he wrote, 'for instance, tolerance with regard to religion is necessary in the Confederation.'

Nevertheless, among a small group of the Enlightened intellectual youth, after the middle of the eighteenth century, a definite growth in the feeling of Swiss unity became discernible. They began to stress the fact that the Confederation shared not only the need of common security, peace and order, but the re-awakened

Tell for his revolutionary propaganda in 1798 and distributed a 'Father Our of a true and free Swiss' which began:

> Wilhelm Tell, der du bist der Stifter unserer Freyheit,
> Dein Name werde geheiliget in der Schweiz;
> Dein Wille geschehe auch jetzt bey uns,
> Wie zur Zeit, da du über deine Tyrannen gesiegt hast. . . .
> (Wilhelm Tell, who thou art the founder of our liberty, thy name be sanctified in Switzerland;
> Thy will be done among us now as it was done at the times when thou defeated thy tyrants. . . .)

memories of a unique past in which the word liberty resounded, and the newly found attachment to the beauty of Swiss nature. In his letter to the Maréchal du Luxembourg of January 20, 1763, Rousseau spoke of the thirteen cantons of Switzerland as 'une grande ville, divisée en treize quartiers' (a great city, divided into thirteen quarters) all the inhabitants of which were suffering from *le hemvé* (*heimweh*, homesickness). Such a feeling of Swiss patriotism existed not only among the German-Swiss in the ruling and sovereign thirteen cantons but also in the subject lands of the Vaud and the Tessin. Rousseau was a citizen of Geneva, not of Switzerland, but he was proud of the city's association with the Confederation. In Vaud, Abraham Ruchat (1678–1750) published in 1714 *Les Délices de la Suisse*, where he wrote regretfully about the fact that the German- and the French-speaking Swiss knew so very little of each other: 'Les Suisses Allemans sont peu instruits au sujet des Romands; et les Romands, auxquels la langue Allemande est autant barbare que dans le cœur de la France, connoissent encore moins les Allemans.' Together with Loys de Bochat and Seigneux de Correvon, Ruchat edited from 1732 the *Mercure Suisse* which appeared for half a century and was later called *Journal Helvetique*. Thus a nascent Swiss feeling permeated even the subject lands, where the local autonomies and self-government, preserved by the ruling cantons, made the education to an understanding of democracy and of national unity possible.

Strongest, however, was the feeling of this new Swiss patriotism among small, highly literate groups in the German-speaking cities of Zürich and Berne, Basle and Lucerne. Characteristic of the new trend was a book which Franz Urs Balthasar of Lucerne published in Basle in 1759 and which he called *Patriotic Dreams of a Swiss Confederate Concerning a Means to Rejuvenate the Obsolete Confederation*. Printed in Free Town by Wilhelm Tell's Heirs. (*Patriotische Träume eines Eidgenossen von einem Mittel, die veraltete Eidgenossenschaft wieder zu verjüngen*. Freistadt bei Wilhelm Tells Erben.) These 'dreams' influenced some citizens, who met in April 1760, at the celebration of the tercentenary of the foundation

of the University of Basle, then Switzerland's only university. They discussed the establishment of a Helvetic Society to reawaken among the Swiss the awareness of their belonging together, thus helping them to regain an honoured position for their country. One year later the Society was actually founded in Schinznach. It held its annual meetings, which became manifestations of the Swiss will for unity, in various cities until 1797; in that year the Society met for the last time in Aarau, a city which had become its permanent headquarters two years earlier. Heinrich Zschokke (1771–1848), a prolific German writer, who lived from 1795 on in Switzerland and witnessed the end of the Helvetic Society, praised it for offering an opportunity where 'the most worthy men of the fatherland learned to love one another; in these holy meetings, the flame of the ancient confederacy once more blazed pure and noble.'[1] In spite of its enthusiasm the Society did not achieve any actual reforms: its methods were purely literary and practically ineffective and thus unable to even dent the rigid social and political structure of the obsolete Confederacy. Yet by its educational efforts the Society prepared the leaders for the future, whose time came when forces from the outside reinforced the longing for a new life. The Society was due to assemble in Aarau again in May 1798, but by this time its meeting hall served another purpose: the Helvetic Republic had been born, the first Swiss legislative assembly was meeting in the hall, and among its members were many who had formed part of, and had been educated by, the Society.[2]

[1] Heinrich Zschokke, *The History of Switzerland*, tr. by Francis George Shaw (New York: Albert Mason, 1875), p. 237.

[2] The most interesting educational experiment was started in the Grisons by Ulysses von Salis in his castle Haldenstein for the education of future leaders in the spirit of Roman republicanism and patriotism. The school was called Rätisches Seminar—Raetia or Rhaetia being the name of the Roman province of which the Grisons with the chief town of Curia Raetica (today Chur or Coire) formed the western part. The school was later transferred to Marschlins. The Helvetic Society was renewed in Schinznach in 1819 and continued to exist until 1849, when most of its goals had been achieved by the Swiss Constitution of 1848.

— 3 —

ENLIGHTENED PATRIOTISM

THE representative thinkers of this Swiss enlightened patriotism were the historian Johannes Müller and the educator Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi.[1] Both were patriots and cosmopolitan humanists, whose roots in an ancient republican tradition broadened their understanding of history. In 1786 Müller sent the first volume of his *Die Geschichten Schweizerischer Eidgenossenschaft* to his fellow-Swiss with a dedication, in which he called them to unity and patriotic action. There he summed up the unique character of the nascent Swiss nationality. 'In the present book it is my main intention to present how little we can do if we remain in isolation, but what strength a free nation can find in co-operation, and how the prejudices and sophistries, which drive you into civil wars and mutual distrust, are your only truly frightful enemies.... All peoples fight courageously for their ancient rights; but only intelligent people act in good time; those who wait until they are forced to act by an emergency, will do everything passionately, in a precipitate way and with great exaggeration.... We have constitutions according to which the free hand and voice of the poorest Alpine shepherd carry the same weight as the authority of the patrician who is honoured by dignity, wealth, ancestry, and age.... Republics of different origin and language and of twofold religious allegiance—and this difference in religion separated men for a long time more than any other circumstances —republics, so unequal in size, that one of them is more powerful than ten others, which, however, are legally equal with the greatest one, all these republics, which are almost alien one to the other, are held together by a word pledged centuries ago.... It is strange how the Bible seems to fit no other people better than

[1] See Hans Kohn, *The Idea of Nationalism* (New York: Macmillan, 1944), pp. 382–385, 389.

you. What was originally a community of free shepherds grew into a Confederation of as many cantons as there were tribes in Biblical times. This Confederation received three laws from God. If you keep them faithfully, you are invincible: to remain always, in war and peace, closely united by your patriotic habits and the joy of common festivities, one nation like one family; not to think of commercial profits as Tyre did, nor of conquest but to dwell on your inherited lands with your herds in innocence and freedom; to regard the imitation of foreign principles and habits as the end of your constitution.'[1]

Like so many of his contemporaries, Müller drew upon Biblical history and classical tradition to find there the inspiration for the new nationalism. He concluded his lectures on the history of the ancient world, on January 20, 1786, in Berne with a discourse about the means for restoring national strength: 'Especially in republics nothing politically good or great can be achieved which is not founded upon the moral fibre of each individual; thus it is impossible to strengthen the Confederation or to fight a successful defensive war if our whole way of life, our education, our studies do not become more national. The laws of the Chinese and of Moses have survived so many revolutions and centuries, because they were so strongly interwoven into the habits of everyday life that it was impossible for the people to forget them and no tyrant's edicts could destroy them. We can hardly imagine how invincible the strength of our nation would become if the consideration of the common weal were reflected in all our life. The Swiss, stamped as it were from earliest childhood as a

[1] Johannes von Müller, *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Johannes Georg Müller (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1831–1835), 40 parts in 7 vols., vol. VII, pt. I, pp. XXIII, CVII, XVIII, XIX and XXXIII. The first edition of the *Geschichten Schweizerischer Eidgenossenschaft* appeared in 5 vols., 1806–1808. In the controversy about the admissibility of Tell's deed, Müller wrote in the eighteenth chapter of Book I: 'His deed did not conform to the established laws but it resembled those for which the liberators of Athens and Rome and many heroes of the ancient Hebrews have been praised in ancient stories and in sacred books, in order that, when the ancient liberty of a peaceful people cannot resist superior power, men like them be raised to pay back the oppressors. Lawful regents are sacred; but it is neither necessary nor right that oppressors should have nothing to fear.'

free Confederate, would become as unshakably firm as the mountains of his fatherland. . . . Such an education is recommended to us by the nature of our country, by the memories of our forefathers, by the precious remnants of our past. We could easily realize it, if those who excel by birth, rank, or intellect would never forget the patriotic aim and thus set an example not by their words but by their life. They should found a periodical which in popular strong words, without, however, giving offence, would as it is being done in England show up everything unpatriotic either as ridiculous or as dangerous and present everything national as worthy of love and esteem.'[1]

All these exhortations and efforts 'to acquire for our common fatherland a greater morality and political strength' were, however, of no practical avail. The authorities reacted against them with greatest severity. No one was allowed even to criticize the ruling oligarchies which regarded themselves as established by divine will. Strictest censorship forced the newspapers to devote themselves to non-political issues. When Johann Heinrich Waser, a Zürich theologian, published a poem in Schlözer's *Briefwechsel meist historisch-politischen Inhalts* in Göttingen, criticizing the Franco-Swiss alliance of 1777, which promised Swiss mercenaries for the French army, he was sentenced to death and executed.[2] Even after the outbreak of the French Revolution, the democratic rural cantons were in no way willing to grant equality or liberty to the subject territories nor were the urban oligarchies ready to make the slightest concession to the people of the countryside in their cantons.

But a new spirit was abroad in the land, and it was stronger

[1] *Sämtliche Werke*, pt. 23, pp. 333–336. See also Arnold Jaggi, *Ueber Johannes von Müllers Geschichtsauffassung* (Berne: Haupt, 1922).

[2] His poem was called 'Schweizerblut und Franzgeld, politisch gegeneinander abgewogen' (Swiss Blood and French Money, Balanced Politically One Against the Other). It began:

Väter Helvetiens, eure Söhne!
Hirten des Volks! nicht eure Schafe!

(Helvetia's fathers, these are your sons! Shepherds of the people! These are not your sheep!)

in Switzerland than in other countries, because in Switzerland it could find support in national memories. This spirit was expressed in a memorandum which the leaders of Stäfa, a rural community in the canton of Zürich, submitted to their 'gracious masters' in 1794. As did the Anglo-Americans a few decades before, the people of Stäfa appealed to their ancient liberties and privileges and simultaneously to the natural rights of man, as if the two 'freedoms,' the historical and the rational, were identical in origin and purpose. Twenty years before, Johannes Müller had written in a similar spirit in a letter to Füssli on April 7, 1773: 'If I could only contribute to the overthrow of despotism, to the affirmation of the rights of mankind and to the restoration of the most ancient liberty!' The ancient liberties, preserved in the medieval chronicles, revived by the antiquarian curiosity of the Enlightenment and propagated by the members of the Helvetic Society, fused in the imagination of the period, in Switzerland as well as in England, with the new eighteenth-century gospel proclaimed in the Declaration of the Rights of Man and Citizen. Supported by the study 'of history, of old charters and of the inalienable rights of man,' the people of Stäfa demanded equality with the burghers of Zürich, the abolition of serfdom, and the end of the commercial and industrial monopoly of the city. They referred to Switzerland, as the English referred to their country, as 'the land of liberty.' 'Can it be true,' they asked, 'that the love of freedom has died in its own fatherland? No! We would be unworthy descendants of our ancestors if we would not regard as sacred the dear heritage, which they have acquired for us with so many sacrifices, and if we would not keep it intact for our most remote descendants. Descended from free fathers, we shall be free sons!'

The people of Stäfa did not object to the non-democratic character of their constitution, as little as did the eighteenth-century English. They considered it the best constitution, because it protected all citizens against administrative arbitrariness and oppressive taxes, kept all classes in balance and secured economic freedom to all citizens. They demanded not the abolition but the

extension of the constitution, so that it included the whole population and no longer remained buried within the city walls. The people of Stäfa were no revolutionaries; they petitioned only for the restoration of their rights according to ancient documents which had been disregarded by the authorities. The only answer their lawful demands received, was the annulment of their ancient rights and charters by the 'gracious masters.' In addition all persons involved were subject to heavy punishment. Zürich, then the most progressive and enlightened city of the Confederation, its capital, treated the appeal to the ancient Swiss liberties as a criminal offence comparable to an invocation of the rights of man.[1] Only in the realm of poetry was it then allowed to glorify the traditional Swiss liberties. In the fateful year 1789 Johann Ludwig am Buhl's popular *Schweizer Freiheitsgesang* (*Swiss Song of Liberty*) celebrated the fatherland's ancient liberation from the Habsburg yoke, an event which had occurred five hundred years before.

Schön bist du mit deinen Alpenhöhen,
Die da gross in Morgenwolken stehen
Und der Freiheit stolze Grenzen ziehen! . . .
. . . Die Freiheit lebet noch;
Gesetzen sind wir untertan
Und keinem Herrscherjoch. . . .

[1] See Leonhard von Muralt, *Alte und neue Freiheit in der helvetischen Revolution* (Zürich: Schulthess, 1941). Muralt points out the affinity of the Swiss and of the English development. 'In the history of England and the United States of America, the new liberty grows out of the old rights and liberties. It is not established against the old privileges, as it happened in France, in the Revolution at the end of the eighteenth century, it rather develops in a long though partly also revolutionary development out of the old order. The thread which was tied in the thirteenth century with the Magna Carta in England could as little be torn as a similar thread in Switzerland.' P. 18. The peasants of Zürich referred to Dutch newspapers in which they learned that it was allowed in England to meet to discuss political and constitutional reforms, something then strictly forbidden in Switzerland. See also Johann Caspar Bluntschli, 'Die schweizerische Nationalität' (1875), reprinted in *Gesammelte Kleine Schriften*, vol. II (Nördlingen, 1881), pp. 114 ff.; Fritz Fleiner, *Entstehung und Wandlung moderner Staatstheorien in der Schweiz* (Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1916); Gottfried Guggenbühl, *Vom Geist der Helvetik* (Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1925); Max Huber, *Grundlagen nationaler Erneuerung* (Zürich: Schulthess, 1934); Richard Feller, *Von der alten Eidgenossenschaft* (Berne: Haupt, 1938).

Friede herrscht in Tälern, sanfter Friede!
Freiheit braust der Strom von Felsenwand!
Freiheit jubeln wir im frohen Liede!
Sei gesegnet, teures Vaterland.[1]

But outside of the realm of poetry, freedom in every sense of the word seemed dead or dying in the Switzerland living through the first decade of the French Revolution.

In the advanced stage of general apathy for which it was itself responsible, the old regime in Switzerland lacked the spiritual resources to meet the new situation. Faced by the dreaded French Revolution, the ruling oligarchies found neither the courage nor the determination to unite and to reorganize the country. Years after the French revolutionary armies had set out to cross their neighbours' frontiers, the ancient and famed military might of the Swiss remained in the most lamentable condition, without army, without finances, without any cohesion or co-operation among the cantons. The threat of the Napoleonic invasion revitalized the British nation and reaffirmed its unbreakable solidarity; after victorious resistance, the British were able to absorb and to develop the beneficial aspects of the French Revolution without foreign imposition and without any violent break in their tradition. Different was the fate of Switzerland. It collapsed before the French invasion, but even this disaster could not overcome the insistence of the cantons on their traditional prerogatives and on their full sovereignty; the foundations of modern nationhood were laid in Switzerland by Napoleon in the constitution which his mediation imposed in 1803; it was to its principles that the Swiss returned in 1848 when they built their democratic nation out of their own strength and resources. Yet their nationalism was not driven into an opposition to the principles

[1] 'You are beautiful, my fatherland with your high Alps, which tower among morning clouds and which draw the proud frontiers of liberty! . . . Liberty still lives; we are subject to laws and to no ruler's yoke. . . . Sweet peace reigns in the valleys! Freedom falls like water over high rocks! Freedom we jubilate in joyful song! Be blessed, dear Fatherland.' The poem was immediately set to music by Johann Heinrich Egli, it was originally to be published in an appendix to Lavater's *Schweizerlieder*. See *The Idea of Nationalism*, p. 183.

of the Enlightenment and of 1789, as was the case with the nationalism of so many other Continental peoples. Like the British, the Swiss found a way to fuse ancient and modern liberties. In 1798 the old Confederation ignominiously died after an existence of five centuries, as did the Holy Roman Empire eight years later, of complete exhaustion and general abandonment. But the ancient foundations of liberty, the humanist traditions and the enduring influence of Napoleon's reforms, allowed the Swiss, after many bitter struggles and upheavals, within fifty years to rebuild their nation as a strong, modern democracy, which achieved, to a degree unknown to its neighbours, liberty under law and unity in diversity.

4

SWISS NATIONALITY AND THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

WITH the seventeenth century, the era of religious wars ended in Europe; with the French Revolution, linguistic and ethnic nationalism inaugurated an age of new and equally bitter conflicts. The Swiss Confederation had been able to survive the time of religious troubles though only as a loose alliance of independent states jealous of their religious character and exclusiveness. The new age of nationalism posited even graver problems for the Confederation, in which German was the only official language and in which territories speaking French and Italian were kept in subjection. In 1512 the Grisons, an associate member of the Confederation, conquered the Lombard districts of Val Tellina, Chiavenna and Bormio and ruled them in a hard and oppressive way. In 1797 after Napoleon's proclamation of the Cisalpine Republic these Italian-speaking subjects sent a delegation to Milan to demand the union with the new Republic. They accused their 'masters' of having broken ancient treaties and of having maladministered the land, and therefore declared their relationship with the Grisons ended. On October 10, 1797, Bonaparte issued a decree from his headquarters in Italy in which he announced that 'the people of Val Tellina, Chiavenna and Bormio are free to reunite with the Cisalpine Republic.' He based this proclamation on the new revolutionary right of peoples, for 'the Grisons undoubtedly violated their treaties with the Val Tellina, Chiavenna and Bormio; consequently these people have recovered the rights which nature gives to all peoples; moreover, no people can be subject to another people without violating thereby the principles of public and natural law.'

In a better situation than the subjects of the Grisons were the Italian-speaking inhabitants of Tessin, who were subjects not of a

single canton but of the whole Confederation. In its southward expansion beyond the St. Gotthard in the fifteenth century (1402–1512), the Confederation had acquired the territories of Lugano and Bellinzona. Though the Confederation did little to promote economic and cultural progress there, its rule was on the whole not oppressive and protected the Tessin from being involved in the wars which devastated Lombardy. The establishment of the Cisalpine Republic evoked an echo in the hearts of the Tessin population, too, but its overwhelming majority rejected the 'reunion' with Lombardy and demanded to become free and equal members of the Swiss Confederation. Their party adopted the slogan 'Liberi e Svizzeri.' When Cisalpine partisans tried to invade Lugano, the people repelled them on February 15, 1798, and proclaimed the independence of the Tessin as a member of the Confederation. This loyalty towards the Confederation represented an event of great though little noticed significance in the history of nationalism. By all 'natural' ties—language and ethnic descent, geography, and economic laws—the people of the Tessin formed part of Lombardy; from Switzerland they were separated not only by the barriers of language, but also by high mountains which at the time effectively barred commerce and contact. Moreover, Italy seemed then rising to great promise and prominence under the guiding hand of Bonaparte; the Swiss Confederation was then on the verge of debacle. In spite of all these factors the people of Lugano decided for Switzerland. Political loyalty and the ideals of constitutional liberty counted more than race, language and 'national' liberty. On May 1, 1798, the Italian-speaking districts of Lugano and Bellinzona were united to constitute the canton Tessin.

This voluntary adhesion on the part of the Tessin demanded a new status for the Italian language in the Confederation. Similar recognition for the French language became urgent when the French Revolution spread to the French-speaking Vaud, a subject land of the canton Berne.[1] There, too, Bonaparte's word to the

[1] See on the influence of the French Revolution in Switzerland: Gustave Gautherot, *La Révolution française dans l'ancien éveché de Bâle. I. La République*

Grisons, 'No people can be another people's subject' made a deep impression. The soil had been well prepared since 1791. From St. Petersburg Frederic César de Laharpe (1754–1838), the tutor of the future Tsar Alexander I, agitated for the independence of his native Vaud. Like the people of Stäfa he appealed to the Vaud's ancient liberties and treaties which, he claimed, had been violated by the Bernese. A premature uprising in July 1791, led by his cousin Amadée de Laharpe, collapsed; its leader, sentenced to death *in absentia*, took refuge in France and died a few years later, fighting as a general in Bonaparte's Italian army. His cousin, under Berne's pressure, was recalled from Russia in 1795; at the end of the following year he directed a bitter literary campaign against Berne from Paris. Preparations were made for an uprising and its slogans fused the new French revolutionary inspiration with Swiss patriotic traditions. On January 24, 1798, the Republic of the Leman was proclaimed in Lausanne; the national colours of Berne were replaced by a green cockade, green supposedly being the colours of Wilhelm Tell; three national holidays were planned, the anniversaries of the Grutli-oath (the legendary foundation-act of the Swiss Confederation), of the fall of the Bastille, and of the declaration of Leman's independence. A new local Marseillaise was sung, which praised Switzerland and France at the same time.

> Que le feu du patriotisme
> Brûle, enflamme, embrace nos sens.
> Terrassons l'affreux despotisme,
> De Tell redevenons enfants.
>
> Un peuple grand et magnanime,
> Vainqueur d'ennemis menacans,
> Nous a montré, que les tyrans
> De leur complots sont la victime.

From the beginning the new Republic of the Leman, even more short-lived than most of the creations of French revolutionary

rauracienne (Paris: H. Champion, 1907); Edouard Chapuisat, *L'Influence de la Révolution française sur la Suisse. Le département du Leman*, Cahiers de la Révolution française, No. 2 (Paris: Receuil Sirey, 1934); Edouard Chapuisat, *La Suisse et la Révolution française* (Geneva: Editions du Mont Blanc, 1945).

foreign policy, was envisaged as the forerunner of a new Switzerland, of 'la République Helvetique, une et indivisible' a (Helvetic republic, one and indivisible). The cantons were expected to follow Lausanne's example and to unite 'pour former de nouveau un seul et même peuple libre' (to form again one united people), as if they had ever possessed national unity before. But the past seemed at the moment doomed. The feeble resistance of Berne, abandoned in spite of the entreaties of her first magistrate Niklaus Friedrich von Steiger (1729–1799) by most of her allies and associates, quickly collapsed before the invading French army. On March 5, 1798, the proud city, which never before had received an enemy within her walls, opened her gates to the victorious invaders. The old Confederation was dead.

— 5 —

THE HELVETIC REPUBLIC

THE old Confederation was replaced by the Constitution of April 12, 1798. Drawn up by Peter Ochs (1752–1821) of Basle and by Laharpe, the new constitution laid the foundation of modern Switzerland.[1] Conceived, however, in the French tradition of centralization and authoritarian executive power, it conflicted too strongly with the Swiss spirit of local self-government and respect for individual differences to win general acceptance.[2] Madame de Staël, equally familiar with France and Switzerland, deplored the conquest of the ancient 'citadel of freedom and republicanism' in the name of those very things. 'Undoubtedly Berne and other Swiss cities possessed unjust privileges,' she wrote in her *Considérations sur les principaux événements de la Révolution Française*, 'and these old prejudices interfere with the democracy of the small cantons; but was it possible by force to improve countries which were accustomed to recognize only the slow and progressive action of time? The political institutions of Switzer-

[1] See Carl Hilty, *Oeffentliche Vorlesungen über die Helvetik* (Berne: Max Fiala, 1878). Hilty (1833–1909), originally a lawyer in Coire (Grisons), from 1874 on professor of law in Berne, dedicated his book which originated in lectures delivered in 1875 and 1877, 'to all good patriots of the present time.' He saw in the Helvetic Constitution the first attempt to establish democracy on the soil of the historical Confederation. In his insistence upon thorough democratic domestic liberty and strict national isolation against all foreign influences, Hilty recalls similar trends in the United States. Both nations fused different peoples into a cohesive state with the help of a strong political idea based upon individual liberty. 'Unser Vaterland,' Hilty wrote of Switzerland in words which could, with a difference, be applied to the United States, 'ist eines der hervorragendsten Beispiele, wie eine kräftige politische Idee unbedeutende und selbst ungleichartige Völkerstämme zu einem bedeutenden Staate umbilden kann.' (Our fatherland is an outstanding example of how a strong political idea can transform . . . very different peoples into an important nation.)

[2] Adolf Gasser, 'Die Irrwege der Helvetik,' *Zeitschrift für Schweizerische Geschichte*, XXVII (1947), pp. 425–455.

land, it is true, have been in many ways perfected [by the Helvetic Constitution]. . . . But the unity and patriotic energy have lost much since the revolution. One got accustomed to have recourse to foreign powers and to participate in the political passions of other nations, while Switzerland's sole interest consists in being peaceful, independent and proud.'[1] On the other hand, a modern Swiss historian rightly points out that only 'the Helvetic Constitution transformed Switzerland into a state. It endowed it for the first time with a parliament representing the whole country and with a government reaching out throughout the nation. The advocates of the new Constitution saw in it the foundation for the birth of a Swiss nation.'[2]

The Helvetic Constitution abolished all privileges and established the equality of individuals and of territories. For the first time it created a common Swiss nationality and removed all the many internal barriers to trade and intercourse. 'The Helvetic Republic is one and indivisible,' the first article of the new constitution declared. 'No longer are there frontiers which separate cantons and subject lands, or canton and canton. The unity of the fatherland and of its interests replaces the weak tie which haphazardly brought together and guided the heterogeneous, unequal and disproportionate parts, which were subjected to the domestic prejudices of tiny territories. Switzerland was weak in the whole weakness of each individual part; Switzerland will be strong through the strength of all united.' The new Constitution breathed the ideological spirit of 1795, which in France herself was very soon to give way to the more concise style of Napoleonic command. Article 14 vibrated with the revolutionary lyricism of the great decade which was at that very time drawing to its close: 'The citizen owes himself to the fatherland, to his family, and to all those who are oppressed. . . . He renounces all personal hatred and all vanity. He desires only the moral improvement of

[1] See Pierre Kohler, *Madame de Staël et la Suisse* (Lausanne: Payot, 1916), p. 241. Madame de Stael's opinion does not differ fundamentally from Hilty's.

[2] Edgar Bonjour, in Hans Nabholz, Leonhard von Muralt, Richard Feller and Edgar Bonjour, *Geschichte der Schweiz* (Zürich: Schulthess & Co., 1938) vol. II, p. 323.

humanity; he invites unceasingly to sweet brotherly love.' In a similar spirit article 24 read: 'Every citizen, on reaching the age of twenty, must inscribe himself on the civic register of his canton and must swear to serve his fatherland and the cause of liberty and equality.'

Of greater importance was the fact that for the first time the new Constitution proclaimed full freedom of religion and of conscience and introduced universal suffrage. In spite of the fact that all real power was concentrated, after the French model, in the hands of the Directory, an executive committee of five members, the years of the Helvetic Republic witnessed the birth of Swiss political life and journalism in an atmosphere impregnated with the spirit of modern liberty. Paul Usteri (1768–1831), a physician from Zürich and the founder and editor of the *Schweizerische Republikaner*, addressed his fellow-members in the new Swiss Senate on October 4, 1798, in a patriotic oration in which he asserted the meaning and the continuity of Swiss history: 'Blessed be Thou, God of our Fathers, Who for thousands of years hast been the protector of Helvetia's freedom; Thou callst the half-extinguished spirit of Helvetia's freedom to new life. The barbaric rule of despotism has for many centuries believed to have banished the genius of liberty from the earth. In reality he had withdrawn into the Swiss mountains and valleys. There for a long time he was the still and peaceful God of the homes of our distant ancestors, for the genius of liberty is above all a genius of peace, of friendship and happiness of the home. When the quiet life of our fathers was threatened by the arrogant arbitrariness of the miserable servants of princes, the genius of liberty installed in our fathers a manly courage and the spirit of those eternal alliances, the result of a revolution which, guided by the pure flame of liberty, did not cause mankind any tears. . . . The long peace, which Switzerland enjoyed for the last three centuries, justly strengthened the attachment to the Constitution, to which one owed the peace; but it also blinded against the original or later shortcomings of the Constitution, which became more obvious with the growth of the Enlightenment which developed new

concepts of society, loosened the old ties and created the need for new ones. . . . May Thou, God of our Fathers, look with favour upon the new Swiss Confederation, as Thou didst look upon the old confederations; we are renewing the covenant of our fathers, the covenant for freedom and peace; we only have adapted the old forms to the changing times and have fused the many different constitutions into one, but the virtues and principles, which once founded the old covenants and long maintained them in their purity, shall also form the spirit and life of the new covenant.'[1]

This illusion which regarded the Helvetic Republic as the organic continuation of the old Confederation soon was dissipated. The Franco-Swiss alliance of August 1798 transformed the Swiss territory into a battlefield for the French armies in their wars with Europe. The cherished ancient liberties and the equally cherished traditional neutrality disappeared. The Swiss Government had to adopt dictatorial measures in order to enforce military requirements. One certainly could not speak of a reign of terror and harshness in Switzerland.[2] Even the Helvetic leaders continued to stress the need to respect and protect individual liberty as against the demands of the revolutionary or of the national state. One of them, Dr. Albrecht Rengger (1764–1835), minister of the interior of the Helvetic Republic, wrote in 1796: 'Salus populi suprema lex esto is the most pernicious slogan ever propagated by a fiendish mind. . . . One commits the horrors, formerly committed for the glory of God, now in the name of the welfare of mankind: On these scales whole generations alive now have no weight compared with the dream of the future.' Paul Usteri said in the Helvetic Senate: 'Whether the man who rules arbitrarily over liberty be named Paul or Peter or Frederic Caesar,

[1] The full text of the speech in *Actensammlung aus der Zeit der helvetischen Republik 1798–1803*, ed. by Johannes Stickler, 11 vols. (Berne, 1886–1911), vol. III, pp. 67 ff. See also Gottfried Guggengühl, *Bürgermeister Paul Usteri. Ein schweizerischer Staatsmann aus der Zeit der französischen Vorherrschaft und des Frühliberalismus*, 2 vols. (Aarau: Sauerländer, 1924–1931).

[2] 'Blut floss nicht. Keine Guillotine und kein politisches Todesurteil überhaupt hat auch in dieser Schreckenszeit den Boden der Schweiz befleckt. Dieses blieb der Restoration und ihren Helden vorbehalten.' Hilty, *op. cit.*, p. 292.

whether he rules in the name of liberty or in the name of tyranny, whether he adheres to the banner of liberty or to the banner of despotism—without individual freedom political liberty is only a deception.' And in his *Schweizerische Republikaner* he wrote: 'Never can a good end justify unjust means. Law must always be sacred.'[1]

In the country at large, the strongly entrenched sentiments of local autonomy and of traditional diversity revolted against centralized uniformity. Dissatisfaction became general; the rural Catholic cantons were the most irreconcilably opposed to the new order. The widespread unrest rendered the constitution unworkable, yet the Swiss among themselves were unable to arrive at any generally acceptable solution. Governments were overthrown in quick succession, new constitutional projects were elaborated but found no practical application. Men like Jakob Schweizer, pastor in Embrach near Zürich, openly voiced their horror of the revolution and their loyalty to the old Governments. In February 1800 he published his *Zuruf eines Helvetiers an alle warmen Vaterlandsfreunde* (*Appeal of a Helvetian to all warm friends of the fatherland*), comparing the good old times of order and peace with the present turmoil. He demanded a plebiscite of the Swiss people to decide about their return to a policy of full neutrality. His *Neues Helvetisches Volksblatt* and his pamphlet *Ein freimütiges Wort eines freimütigen Schweizers an die helvetische Regierung in Bern und an die Männer, welche dem Vaterland eine*

[1] 'Das salus populi suprema esto ist der verderblichste Wahlspruch, den irgendein feindseliger Geist nur ausstreuen konnte. . . . Die Greuel, die sonst zur Ehre Gottes geschahen, werden jetzt zum Wohle der Menschheit verübt: eine Wagschale, auf der ganze Generationen neben einem Traum der Zukunft kein Gewicht mehr haben.' Quoted in *Neue Schweizer Rundschau*, Nov. 1947, p. 406. 'Mag der Mann, dessen Willkür über die Freiheit herrscht, Paul oder Peter oder Friedrich Cäsar heissen, mag er im Namen der Freiheit oder in dem der Tyrannei handeln, mag er zur Fahne der Freiheit oder des Despotismus geschworen haben, —ohne die persönliche Freiheit ist die politische nur ein täuschendes Wort.'—'Ewig und unter keinen Umständen kann eine gute Absicht ungerechte Mittel rechtfertigen! Das Recht soll ausschliessend heilig sein!' Paul Wernle, *Der schweizerische Protestantismus in der Zeit der Helvetik, 1798–1803*, 2 vols. (Zürich: Max Niehans, 1938–1942), vol. I, p. 100.

neue Verfassung geben werden' (*An open word of a free Swiss to the Helvetian Government in Berne and to the men who will give a new constitution to the fatherland*) clamoured for the return to the ancient federalism. The Bernese general Rudolf von Erlach founded a Committee for the Restoration of the old Swiss Confederation. Armed insurrections produced an almost complete chaos: the mood of the country turned more and more against France and against the Revolution.

This situation induced the First Consul to impose his mediation. From St. Cloud he called upon the Swiss to abandon their petty factionalism and to devote themselves to the common needs of the fatherland: 'People of Helvetia, regain hope! Your fatherland is on the brink of the precipice: at the very brink it will be saved.... Every reasonable man must understand that the mediation which I undertake is a blessing bestowed upon Switzerland by that Providence, which among so many upheavals and turmoils has always guarded the existence and independence of your nation, and that this mediation represents the only means to save both. For the time has come for you to consider, that if the patriotism and the unity of your ancestors founded your republic, the evil spirit of your factions, if it continues, infallibly will destroy it; it will be painful to think that at a time when a number of new republics arose, one of the oldest had to perish.'[1]

The constitutions which Napoleon imposed upon Switzerland as a whole and upon the individual cantons saved Switzerland not only from chaos but also from the danger of a reactionary restoration of the old Confederation and from a bitter civil war. It secured ten years of well-being and order for the nation at a time when most European lands suffered from wars and revolutionary changes. It recognized the federal principle as it had existed before 1798, but in a regenerated and modernized form, successfully striking the balance between ancient liberties and usages, the needs of a modern state, and the new demands of liberty and equality. The one and indivisible republic disappeared

[1] See the proclamation of St. Cloud, dated September 30, 1802, in *Correspondance de Napoléon Premier*, vol. VIII, pp. 69–71.

for ever after five years of troubled existence. At no time did the Swiss recall kindly the Constitution of 1798: it was too alien to the national spirit and tradition. On the other hand, the Constitution of 1803, imposed by the mediation, was invoked with ever-growing longing and respect after 1815 when the Restoration abolished almost all of its beneficial innovations. The Constitution of 1848 looked back to that of 1803 as a model.

Yet the Helvetic Republic was the first period in Swiss history to recognize the need for the creation of an *esprit national*. The time was too short, the methods employed were too hasty to allow for success. After four years of Helvetic existence, on January 6, 1802, Bonaparte summed up the situation: 'Vous êtes sans organisation, sans gouvernement, sans volonté nationale.' But the Helvetic leaders showed a true patriotic spirit. Philippe Albert Stapfer of Brugg (1766–1804), before the Revolution professor of politics in Berne and then the first Swiss minister of education and arts, drew up excellent plans to raise the general level of education, to found schools and libraries, even to establish a national university. 'Dieses Institut wird der Brennpunkt der intellektuellen Kräfte unserer Nation, das Verschmelzungsmittel ihrer noch immer fortbestehenden einzelnen Völkerschaften und der Stapelort der Kultur der drei gebildeten Völker sein, deren Mittelpunkt Helvetien ausmacht.' (This institution will become the focus of the intellectual forces of our nation. It will be the means of fusing its still separated peoples and it will become the repository of the civilizations of the three cultured nations, which find their meeting ground in Switzerland.) 'Perhaps it is destined to unite German depth (*Tiefsinn*) with French alacrity (*Gewandtheit*) and Italian taste (*Geschmack*).' Stapfer created a *bureau d'esprit public* and named Zschokke its director. Stapfer's efforts were strongly supported by Pestalozzi, who in the fall of 1798 passionately defended the Helvetic Republic and France, 'our saviour.'[1] Stapfer and the Helvetic Republic have the great merit

[1] See Pestalozzi's leaflets and proclamations in his *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by L. W. Seyffarth, 12 vols. (Liegnitz: S. Seyffarth, 1899–1902), vol. VIII, pp. 161 ff, 189 ff, 241 ff. Pestalozzi edited the semi-official *Helvetisches Volksblatt*, which began

of having supported and financed Pestalozzi's educational reform projects. Under the influence of Rousseau, they also sought to institute national festivals in order to arouse the national spirit and to cement national unity. But like most of their programmes this one, too, was never realized.

Many of the Helvetic spokesmen regarded the exclusive emotional attachment to the canton as the root of Swiss political and spiritual weakness. Their arguments were taken up by the patriotic reformers of the 1830's. On December 3, 1798, a parliamentary commission expressed the opinion that 'the various states (*Staatskörper*) which formerly composed Switzerland, were constituted in an age when political egoism or local isolationism (*Lokalitätsgeist*) were most highly developed. . . . Our former rulers and the Constitution of the Confederation promoted this narrow-minded local isolationism instead of lessening it in accord with the progress of general enlightment in Europe. Each citizen regarded as his fatherland only the community where he enjoyed traditional civic rights (*wo er verbürgert war*), and at best the canton, while he looked upon the other inhabitants of the canton, outside his home community, as step-brothers, and upon the inhabitants of other cantons as strangers. . . . Nothing can become more dangerous to our new Constitution than this exclusive attachment to canton and home community (*Kantons- und Lokalgeist*).'[1] This attachment to local autonomies and traditional liberties could act as a safeguard for concrete individual rights against the claims of an abstract whole. But the élan of the Revolution was needed to shake and finally to break the resistance of obsolete privileges to the demands of modern democracy. In the last one hundred years

to appear on September 8, 1798. He resigned after a few weeks and the *Volksblatt* ceased publication on February 28, 1799. Pestalozzi was unable to write in a sufficiently popular style. Zschokke did better in his 'Der aufrichtige und wohlerfahrene Schweizer Bote, welcher nach seiner Art einfältiglich erzählet, was sich im lieben schweizerischen Vaterlande zugetragen und was ausserdem die klugen Leute und die Narren in der Welt tun.' (The sincere and well-experienced Swiss Messenger, who relates in his own way and simply, what has happened in our dear Swiss Fatherland and what the intelligent people and the fools are doing in the world outside.)

[1] See Gasser, *op. cit.*, p. 437.

linguistic equality has been so generally recognized in Switzerland, that it is easily forgotten that it was the Revolution of 1798, which, against the inertia of tradition and the claims of efficiency, gave to the French and Italian languages equal rank with German as the official languages of the new state.

In July 1898 the people of Tessin demanded 'che tutte le leggi ed ordini che verrano rilasciati dalle autorita elvetiche vengano anche stampati in linguaggio italiano a spense dell' intera nacione' (that all laws and ordinances issued by the Helvetic authorities be also printed in Italian at the expense of the whole nation). The demand was accepted by the Helvetic Republic. Laharpe, envisaging the difficulties of a multi-lingual administration, nevertheless stressed its advantages for the nation and for mankind: the need to study the three languages would dissipate 'the barbaric prejudices which turn men first into competitors, then into enemies and finally into slaves.'[1] The existence of three official languages had one further advantage for the peaceful cohabitation of different languages and peoples in one political body: the use of a neutral language, in this case—as probably always in the Western world —of Latin, to compose inscriptions equally acceptable to all groups. On July 7, 1798, when the inscription of the new Swiss coins was discussed—the Helvetic Republic for the first time introduced a common Swiss monetary system—a German Swiss demanded the use of the German language, because the seal of the Republic was in German. The French suggested the use of German on one side of the coin and of French on the other. But as such a solution would not have given satisfaction to the Italian-speaking Swiss, it was decided to use Latin. The Latin inscription has been maintained on Swiss coins and stamps until today.

[1] 'Que la necessité bien réconnue d'apprendre l'allemand, le français et l'italien augmenterait les communications et les relations de toute espèce, procurerait à la patrie des sources d'instruction multipliées, en ouvrant tous les trésors particuliers à ces trois idiomes, et dissiperait ces préjugés barbares qui rendent les hommes rivaux, puis enemis, puis esclaves.' Weilenmann, *op. cit.*, p. 288. On the other hand, widespread anti-semitism among the people, especially the peasants, frustrated all the efforts of the Helvetic leaders to get Jewish political emancipation approved. See Wernle, *op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 149–158.

— 6 —

NAPOLEON AND SWISS NATIONALITY

IN the message which Napoleon addressed to the Swiss on December 10, 1802, and with which he justified his mediation, he proved to be at the height of his powers in understanding the Swiss situation: 'Citizens deputies of the eighteen cantons of the Helvetic Republic, the situation of your fatherland is critical: moderation, prudence, and the sacrifice of your passions are needed to save it. I have obliged myself before Europe to make my mediation effective. But what is difficult without your help, will become simple with your assistance and influence.

'Switzerland resembles no other state, neither by the events which have taken place there for several centuries, nor by its geographic situation and the difference of languages, religions and customs which exists among its various parts. Nature herself has made your state a federation. No wise man will try to defeat Nature. . . . The desire and the interest of your nation and of the great powers surrounding it demand: equality of your eighteen cantons; a sincere and voluntary renunciation of their privileges on the part of the patrician families; a federal organization within which each canton will be organized according to its language, religion, customs, interest and opinions.'

The new Constitution of February 19, 1803, restored the ancient Confederation; Switzerland was no longer a nation, one and indivisible, but again an alliance of sovereign cantons. The ephemeral green-red-gold flag of the Helvetic Republic disappeared: the banners of the cantons were the only colours flown. Switzerland had no longer a national flag. But thanks to Napoleon article III of the new constitution maintained the chief gain of the Helvetic period: 'There exist neither subject lands nor any privileges of locality, birth, persons and families.' The

number of the XIII sovereign cantons was now increased to nineteen: the formerly subject territories of Aargau, Thurgau, Tessin and Vaud and the formerly associated lands of Grisons and St. Gallen were admitted as cantons with equal rights.[1] The present territorial configuration of the cantons was established in 1803: the contemporary map of Switzerland goes in its main outline back to Napoleon's mediation. Zürich was no longer the capital (Vorort) of Switzerland, but six cantons, three of them Protestant and three Catholic, presided in yearly turn, and the highest official represented under the title Landamann the highest executive office of the land. There was no longer any Swiss parliament; the old Diet as an assembly of diplomatic envoys of the sovereign cantons was revived but its powers were expanded, especially in military matters, and some of the precious gains of the Helvetic Constitution—liberty of migration and establishment throughout all the cantons, freedom of trade and movements, a unified monetary system and the interdiction of alliances of the cantons among themselves and with foreign states—were preserved.

Napoleon treated Switzerland with greater consideration than any other satellite or allied state. His sympathies for Switzerland can probably be explained by his recollections of Corsica and of Rousseau. He found in Switzerland a similar spirit of traditionalism and of liberty as in his native island; Rousseau who had deeply influenced Napoleon's youth, was not only Swiss but saw in Switzerland a model. Thus during the wars of 1805 and 1809 Switzerland was allowed to preserve her neutrality. After 1809 the country was surrounded on all sides by territory controlled

[1] The Valais was constituted by Bonaparte in 1802 as a Rhodanic Republic under the joint protectorate of the French, the Cisalpine and the Helvetic republics. In 1810 it was annexed by France and formed its department of the Simplon. Geneva was annexed by France in 1798. Neuchâtel, under the nominal sovereignty of the kings of Prussia as princes of Neuchâtel from 1707 to 1857, was after Prussia's defeat in 1806 ruled by the French Marshal Louis Alexandre Berthier as Prince of Neuchâtel until 1814. In 1815 all these three territories became cantons of the Swiss Confederation, thus bringing the number of the cantons up to twenty-two, which is the present number.

by, or allied with, Napoleon. Swiss liberty of action was naturally sharply limited, but hardly any hostility was felt toward Napoleon. As was the case in the lands of the Confederation of the Rhine, many people in Switzerland looked upon the Emperor as a benefactor. Johann Kasper Häfeli (1754–1811), a friend of Lavater, published in October 1807 in the *Neuer Teutscher Merkur* a poem 'Des Siegers Triumph und Wort. An mein schweizerisches Vaterland.' It glorified the heroic deeds of the peace-loving Swiss shepherds in their wars against princes and lords and the glorious exploits of the French armies under Napoleon as equal highlights of history. Napoleon 'the hero of the century' was seen re-ordering the world: mighty empires crumbled before him; others rose at his command; he imposed new laws, frontiers, names and governments. Compared to this ceaseless turmoil, how happy was Switzerland! The Emperor's word guaranteed its peaceful survival.

> Also will's das Geschick! Mächtige Reiche gehn
> Unter; andere hebt höher des Siegers Gunst;
> Andern gibt er Gesetze,
> Grenzen, Namen und Herren neu.
>
> Heil, mein Vaterland, dir! Glücklicher fiel dein Los.
> 'Bleibe, wie ich dich schuf,' sprach des Jahrhunderts Held.
> Hör's! Napoleon sprach es:
> Unverbrüchlich ist Kaiserwort!

On June 7, 1813, after Napoleon's debacle in Russia, Hans von Reinhard (1755–1835) of Zürich, in that year Landamann of Switzerland, opened the Diet praising Napoleon's mediation which had raised in ten years a stable federal structure in an atmosphere of public peace, which had reconciled the most bitter animosities and which, he hoped, would endure for a very long time to come.

As Napoleon's star set, the Swiss experienced neither an inclination toward a war of liberation nor an enthusiasm for national unity. The moral climate of German-speaking Switzerland in 1813 profoundly differed from that prevailing in Germany.

There was in Switzerland no rejection of France, no violent denunciation of the French revolutionary ideas or of Western liberties, no nationalist enthusiasm, no *Aufbruch* or rising of a nationalist youth. The Swiss looked with indifference upon the surging German nationalism north of the Rhine. The Germans had expected the Swiss, who for a long time had been known as valiant fighters for liberty, to join enthusiastically in the war of liberation. Their disappointment and their scorn were great. The Swiss did not harbour any bitter hostility toward Napoleon, certainly none of the almost pathological hatred for the 'alien tyrant' expressed by many German writers. Most Swiss intellectuals shared rather the attitude of Goethe and Heine, and the common people widely regarded Napoleon almost as a second Wilhelm Tell. 'The people never abandoned their feeling of awe for the victorious soldier-emperor, and thus he has survived until today in the folk-songs of the most remote Swiss mountain valleys.'[1] Even Jean Paul, himself formerly an admirer of Napoleon and a warm friend of Switzerland, wrote to Johann David Mummenthaler of Langenfeld: 'Switzerland did not show any moral warmth, remaining cold in the warm war of liberation,' and he went on: 'The Swiss remain no longer Swiss when they are beyond their borders—like all republicans, with the exception of the English, they work only for their own liberty and don't do anything for the liberty of others.'[2] The German nationalists had no understanding for that fact that a people who spoke German and was of German descent, could think and feel in a way different from that of the Germans. Swiss indifference to the

[1] See Edgar Bonjour, *op. cit.*, p. 360: 'Das Volk liess sich in seiner Verehrung für den siegreichen Soldatenkaiser nicht irre machen und so lebt er noch heute bis in entfernteste schweizerische Gebirgstäler im Volkslied fort.' See also Eduard Ziehen, *Die deutsche Schweizerbegeisterung in den Jahren 1750–1815* (Deutsche Forschungen, No. 8, Frankfurt a.M., 1922); Hans Fleig, *Die Schweiz im Schrifttum der deutschen Befreiungszeit 1813–1817* (Basler Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft, No. 9, Basle, 1942); Arnold Jaggi, *Der Befreiungskampf Europas zur Zeit Napoleons I* (Berne: Haupt, 1944); William Martin, *La Suisse et l'Europe 1813–1814* (Lausanne: Payot, 1931).

[2] Eduard Berend, *Jean Paul und die Schweiz* (Frauenfeld: Huber, 1943), pp. 75, 77.

feverish burning German nationalism appeared therefore as *undeutsch*, un-German, a most severe reproach in the nationalist terminology. Yet the romantic enthusiasm of the Germans with its violent rejection of the French and Western outlook did not strike a sympathetic chord in the more sober Swiss who felt themselves closely akin to the rationalism and humanitarianism of the Enlightment.[1]

A Switzerland which was apparently devoid of the characteristic German racial consciousness and heroic warrior spirit and clung to her neutrality, was considered by many Germans unworthy of independence. The famous historian Barthold Georg Niebuhr demanded the reintegration of Switzerland and Holland into a united powerful Germany under Prussian leadership. Equally famous in his own day as a scientist and philosopher of nature was Lerenz Oken (1779–1851), who in 1815, when he was professor in Jena, attacked the Swiss for not joining the Germans in the war of liberation: 'The Swiss alone, though they are Germans as we are, are so degenerate that they wish to remain idle spectators. . . . They wish to gain their liberty not by shedding their own blood but by shedding ours; by their rotten neutrality they wish to make our struggle even more difficult.' 'Does such a German land merit independence?' he asked and he suggested that the Swiss implore the Habsburgs to pardon them for their ancient disloyalty and to take them back into their good graces. (In 1832 Oken accepted a chair at the newly established University of Zürich.) The difference between some German thinking that became more and more representative of Germany on the one hand, and Swiss (and Dutch) thought on the other hand, was also

[1] 'Nicht das geistige Sendungsbewusstsein eines Volkstums, sondern der Zusammenhang verschiedenstämmiger Kulturen, nicht die Einheit von Rasse, Sprache und Glauben, sondern die Versöhnung ihrer Verschiedenartigkeit im Föderalismus, nicht das grosstaatliche Machtideal, sondern der kleinstaatliche Rechtsgedanke machen das Wesen dieser Volksgemeinschaft aus. . . . Ideen wie Freiheit, Recht, Menschlichkeit, die dem Schweizer teuer sind, enthalten gewiss auch irrationale Gefühlswerte. Allein die Art, wie sie in der schweizerischen Eidgenosssenschaft zu verwirklichen versucht werden, gründet immer auf etwas Rationalem.' Alfred Liebi, *Das Bild der Schweiz in der deutschen Romantik* (Berne: Haupt, 1946), p. 83 f.

made clear in a memorandum which the Prussian General Karl Friedrich Freiherr von Knesebeck (1768–1848) submitted on September 28, 1814, to Baron vom Stein: 'If these two states [Switzerland and Holland] wish to regain their independence and to restore their national character which distinguished their ancestors, then they must join the nation to which they belong; only thus can they again become somebody. That means: only within the German unity can the Swiss again become a Swiss and the Batavian again a Batavian. Separated from this unity (*Gesamtheit*), they are—nobody.'

— 7 —

THE RESTORATION IN SWITZERLAND

MANY Swiss feared that an Allied victory might mean a complete return to the old order with its obsolete inequalities: this danger existed, more among certain Swiss themselves than among the Allied monarchs and statesmen; it was the insistence of the latter which forced in 1815 Berne and the rural Catholic cantons to abandon their demands for a complete restoration of the old order and to preserve some of the gains of the revolutionary era. The growth of Switzerland to modern nationhood and democracy was helped, in two decisive moments, by outside forces, themselves denying modern nationhood and democracy, by Napoleon first and, ten years later, by the Allies. Both enforced some form of national agreement upon a Switzerland on the brink of civil war. After Napoleon's defeat, the cantons were in danger of completely abandoning the idea of Swiss nationhood; they could reach an understanding on the new constitution of Switzerland only 'thanks to the constant pressure which the Allied great powers did not cease to exercise upon them.'[1] Berne demanded

[1] William E. Rappard, *La Constitution fédérale de la Suisse* (Neuchâtel: Baconnière, 1948) p. 29. 'Il faut se feliciter pour l'unité et peut-être même pour l'existence de la Suisse que la diplomatie alliée ait su mieux les assurer que les cantons eux-mêmes.' (p. 32). Allied influence was exercised for the cause of liberty. 'Si la volonté expresse des monarques intervint . . ., ce fut, chose remarquable et trop oubliée, pour assigner des limites à une reaction dont l'essor immodéré menaçait de plonger le pays dans l'anarchie et d'y allumer la guerre civile.' Antoine-Elisée Cherbuliez, *De la Démocratie en Suisse*, 2 vols. (Paris: Ab. Cherbuliez, 1843), vol. I, p. 60. Cherbuliez (1797–1869), professor of law and political economy in Geneva from 1835 to 1846, was a utilitarian of the school of Bentham. Of all the Allied powers, Russia and Britain showed themselves most friendly to Switzerland. Alexander I acted under the influence of Laharpe, his former tutor, and of General Antoine Henri Jomini (1779–1869), who like Laharpe was a native of the Vaud. He withdrew from the Allied armies in 1814 when he found that he could not prevent the violation of Swiss neutrality. As a Swiss patriot and as a former French

that the cantons of Vaud and Aargau be reduced to their former status as her subject lands. A similar die-hard attitude was taken by the canton of Grisons. Austria declared herself ready to return the Val Tellina, which in 1797 had become part of Lombardy in protest against the oppression which its inhabitants had to suffer from the Grisons, but only under the condition that the Grisons would grant Val Tellina complete equality with the other parts of the canton. The Grisons refused, and thus Val Tellina remained part of Lombardy.

When on December 29, 1813, the progressive cantons led by Zürich and Basle expressed their desire for the recognition of absolute equality of the old and of the new cantons and for a consolidation of the ancient federal ties, they were opposed by Berne, Uri and Schwyz, Fribourg and Solothurn which threatened civil war, if their demands for a return to the old Confederation of the XIII cantons as it existed before 1798, and in the case of Schwyz even to the Pact of the three cantons of 1315, were not complied with. It took eighteen months of fruitless negotiations, until finally on August 7, 1815, the pressure of the Allies succeeded in making the Swiss agree upon a federal pact (*Bundesvertrag*) and thus to continue the Confederation. The new pact was an alliance of sovereign states; it did not constitute a nation. 'By means of the present federal pact,' the agreement read, 'the twenty-two sovereign cantons of Switzerland unite in order to maintain their security, to preserve their liberty and independence against any attack from without, and to keep order and tranquillity within. They guarantee to support each other's constitutions as determined by the supreme authority of each canton and their territorial integrity.'

Swiss national consciousness was in 1815 in its infancy. Loyalty and political interests still centred upon the canton. Only in the following thirty years did Swiss nationalism, under the influence

officer he declined to participate in the crossing of the Rhine near Basle and in a subsequent invasion of France. On Britain's friendship see A. Lätt, *Europäische Friedensschlüsse seit 1648 und die Schweiz* (Zürich: Verlag Mensch und Arbeit, 1947) p. 59.

of Western liberalism, develop. The confederation of 1815 was a pact between governments, not a decision by the Swiss people or by the populations of the cantons, to whom it was neither submitted for discussion nor for approval. The Swiss agreed only on one point, at least in theory—their mutual protection against war through the recognition of the principle of neutrality from without and through its support by collective security from within. In that respect, the year 1815 marked a great advance. After the defeat of Napoleon in the battle of Leipzig on November 18, 1813, the Swiss Diet proclaimed that 'the observation of a strict neutrality has secured the liberty and tranquillity of the fatherland under the almighty protection of God for centuries. It is appropriate to our needs and situation today as it was then. Therefore we wish to uphold it with all the means at our disposal.' The Diet decided to maintain full neutrality and impartiality as between France and the Allies. But Swiss disunity and military unpreparedness made it impossible to enforce the decision. Allied armies crossed Switzerland on their march into France. During the one hundred days, following Napoleon's return from Elba, the Swiss even consented to the passage of Allied forces across Swiss territory and the Swiss army besieged the fortress of Huningen in Alsace near Basle. The Swiss army was under the command of Niklaus Franz von Bachmann-Anderlatz (1740–1831), a patrician of Glarus and a typical representative of the old Swiss mercenary officers' class who had served in many armies, especially in that of the French Bourbons. But the Swiss army did not distinguish itself in this minor operation.

After the final defeat of Napoleon, the recognition of the 'perpetual neutrality' of Switzerland, promised on March 20, 1815, at the Congress of Vienna, was reaffirmed in the second Peace Treaty of Paris on November 20, 1815. In the interest of Europe, the great powers recognized the perpetual neutrality of Switzerland and guaranteed the integrity and inviolability of her territory. Its strategic value in the West, against any new French expansion, was enhanced by the admission of the three cantons of the Valais, Neuchâtel and Geneva as full members of the Confederation and

by the absorption of parts of the old Bishopric of Basle into the canton of Berne, as compensation for its lost subject lands; the inhabitants of those newly acquired French-speaking Bernese possessions in the Jura mountains were assured of a status of complete equality. But in 1815 the victorious Allies did not create Swiss neutrality, they only confirmed and publicly recognized a traditional Swiss attitude, by then almost three hundred years old.[1] This recognition was largely due to the statesmanship of Charles Pictet de Rochemont, a citizen of Geneva (1755–1824), who had lived for many years in England and after his return propagated English ideas in the *Bibliothèque Britannique*, which he and his brother published in Geneva.

Switzerland after 1815 resembled in many ways the German Confederation of the period, as Switzerland before 1798 had resembled the German Reich of that time. There was neither a common Swiss citizenship nor a common monetary system; no liberty of trade or of settlement existed among the cantons; no national postal system facilitated communications and the weights and measures differed not only from canton to canton but even within the cantons. As late as 1846 the cantons could not agree upon the gauge of the railroads to be built. The German economist Friedrich List called Switzerland a 'Konglomerat von Municipalitäten,' a jumble of municipalities, and the old sentence 'Dei provi-

[1] A by-product of neutrality was the right of asylum. 'It was exercised in Switzerland from early times, primarily in favour of religious refugees, but later in favour of political exiles also. It is true that other unneutral countries (especially England) granted asylum to exiles, but that there is a peculiar affinity between neutrality and the right of asylum is shown by the frequency with which the refugee question arises in Swiss history. No country has gone as far as Switzerland in consistently granting asylum to refugees. . . . Thus even Zwingli declared in his "Exhortation to the Godly Confederates" that "all who have been unjustly exiled from other countries have found a refuge in the Confederation. . . . For it is clearly to be seen that your freedom is of good not only to yourselves but to the stranger also, that he may find refuge and respite under your protection as in a place of sanctuary." . . . The peculiarity of the Swiss right of asylum is that it was granted to all in equal measure. It was extended not only to co-religionists but to religious opponents, not only to men of the same, but to men of other political opinions.' Edgar Bonjour, *Swiss Neutrality, its History and Meaning* (London: Allen & Unwin, 1946), p. 27 f.

dentia et confusione hominum Helvetia regitur,' corresponding to the English muddling through, continued to govern Swiss affairs. Two articles of the federal pact of 1815 threatened to increase this confusion in the future. Article 6 laid down the rule that 'the cantons may not form alliances prejudicial to the Confederation or to the rights of the other cantons,' and thus by admitting regional or ideological pacts gave rise to some of the bitter controversies which led to the civil war of 1847. Article 12, which also played its role in the preparation of that 'irresistible conflict,' guaranteed the existence of the religious orders throughout all the cantons, a limitation of their sovereignty, accepted through the pressure of the rural Catholic cantons, which in other respects were the most fervent defenders of fullest cantonal sovereignty.

Only in one respect was real progress made under the new constitution by establishing a federal general staff and federal inspection of cantonal armament and equipment. Thus it created the possibilities for the establishment of a federal army and even of a federal political authority responsible for federal defence. With the growing international tensions after 1830, the preoccupation with problems of military security was the first motive, even taking precedence over those of economic properity, which directed the Swiss toward greater national unity. In 1839, the delegates of Berne, St. Gallen, Vaud and Geneva insisted during the deliberations of the Diet upon the need for a Swiss flag. 'The federal army, which must be animated solely by the federal spirit, must find itself under one flag when it is called upon to defend the common fatherland, its independence and liberty, and all the insignia of the cantonal governments, into which Switzerland is divided in times of peace, must disappear in the moment of danger. Then we must show ourselves as a single nation, as a great family of brothers.' The following year the Swiss national flag was adopted as a symbol marking the growth of the national spirit,[1] which the traditional forces opposed. Their most famous

[1] Rappard, *op. cit.*, p. 100. The Swiss federal army was warmly supported by England, which regarded it as an important element in the European balance of power. Stratford Canning de Radcliffe (1786–1880), who was a British Minister

spokesman was a Bernese patrician, Karl Ludwig von Haller (1768–1854). He looked longingly back to an idyllic, static and pacifist patriarchal order, to which the nation-state and modern liberties were equally alien. In his *Restauration der Staatswissenschaft oder Theorie des natürlich-geselligen Zustands, der Chimäre des künstlich-bürgerlichen entgegengesetzt*, Haller defined a nation as 'an aggregation of dependent or voluntarily subservient people with infinitely different obligations; they have nothing in common but their master. Among themselves they form neither a unity nor a community,' a definition of a nation entirely contrary to its modern concept. Haller wished to preserve diversity against the centralizing and uniforming tendencies of the absolutist and nationalist power-state, but it was a diversity based upon divinely appointed authority and corporate hierarchy.[1] This extreme conservatism was doomed with the revival of the spirit of the French Revolution in the Switzerland of the 1830's. Under its influence, Swiss nationalism quickly developed and found within twenty years an

plenipotentiary in Switzerland from 1814 to 1818 and who became later the famous ambassador to Turkey, showed his diplomatic skill in the support of Swiss neutrality.

[1] Haller was the grandson of Albrecht von Haller (1708–1777), the famous Bernese scientist, critic and poet. As a young man, the grandson came under the influence of the French Revolution and regarded the liberty of the citizen as the ultimate goal of the state. He changed his opinions after 1805, but his political concept always carried a Swiss emphasis on small states. The passage quoted reads in the original: 'Das Volk eines Fürsten ist eine zerstreute Menge von Menschen, ein Aggregat von abhängigen oder freiwillig dienstbaren Leuten mit unendlich verschiedenen Verpflichtungen; sie haben nichts gemeinsam, als ihren gemeinsamen Herrn; unter sich selbst aber machen sie kein Ganzes, keine Kommunität aus.' *Restauration*, vol. II (1817), pp. 74, 119. Ernst Ludwig von Gerlach in his *Aufzeichnungen aus seinem Leben und Werken*, ed. by Jakob von Gerlach (Schwerin, 1903) vol. I, p. 101 f, praised Haller, but missed in his work any understanding for nations, 'a beautiful blossom of the eternal kingdom of God and man.' Haller opposed the dynamism and expansionism of the modern big powers. 'Who needs these closely united terrible masses which frighten the rest of the world? . . . Small states are the true simple natural order to which nature always brings us back.' (*Restauration*, vol. III, p. 179, and vol. II, p. 535.) In 1820 Haller joined the Catholic Church, because it promised best to combat nationalist isolation. He complained that 'each people now wishes to be, as it were, alone in the world, isolated and separated from all others.' (*Restauration*, vol. IV, p. XXI. See also Friedrich Meinecke, *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat*, pp. 218–231.)

spokesman was a Bernese patrician, Karl Ludwig von Haller (1768–1854). He looked longingly back to an idyllic, static and pacifist patriarchal order, to which the nation-state and modern liberties were equally alien. In his *Restauration der Staatswissenschaft oder Theorie des natürlich-geselligen Zustands, der Chimäre des künstlich-bürgerlichen entgegengesetzt*, Haller defined a nation as 'an aggregation of dependent or voluntarily subservient people with infinitely different obligations; they have nothing in common but their master. Among themselves they form neither a unity nor a community,' a definition of a nation entirely contrary to its modern concept. Haller wished to preserve diversity against the centralizing and uniforming tendencies of the absolutist and nationalist power-state, but it was a diversity based upon divinely appointed authority and corporate hierarchy.[1] This extreme conservatism was doomed with the revival of the spirit of the French Revolution in the Switzerland of the 1830's. Under its influence, Swiss nationalism quickly developed and found within twenty years an

plenipotentiary in Switzerland from 1814 to 1818 and who became later the famous ambassador to Turkey, showed his diplomatic skill in the support of Swiss neutrality.

[1] Haller was the grandson of Albrecht von Haller (1708–1777), the famous Bernese scientist, critic and poet. As a young man, the grandson came under the influence of the French Revolution and regarded the liberty of the citizen as the ultimate goal of the state. He changed his opinions after 1805, but his political concept always carried a Swiss emphasis on small states. The passage quoted reads in the original: 'Das Volk eines Fürsten ist eine zerstreute Menge von Menschen, ein Aggregat von abhängigen oder freiwillig dienstbaren Leuten mit unendlich verschiedenen Verpflichtungen; sie haben nichts gemeinsam, als ihren gemeinsamen Herrn; unter sich selbst aber machen sie kein Ganzes, keine Kommunität aus.' *Restauration*, vol. II (1817), pp. 74, 119. Ernst Ludwig von Gerlach in his *Aufzeichnungen aus seinem Leben und Werken*, ed. by Jakob von Gerlach (Schwerin, 1903) vol. I, p. 101 f, praised Haller, but missed in his work any understanding for nations, 'a beautiful blossom of the eternal kingdom of God and. man.' Haller opposed the dynamism and expansionism of the modern big powers. 'Who needs these closely united terrible masses which frighten the rest of the world? ... Small states are the true simple natural order to which nature always brings us back.' (*Restauration*, vol. III, p. 179, and vol. II, p. 535.) In 1820 Haller joined the Catholic Church, because it promised best to combat nationalist isolation. He complained that 'each people now wishes to be, as it were, alone in the world, isolated and separated from all others.' (*Restauration*, vol. IV, p. XXI. See also Friedrich Meinecke, *Weltbürgertum und Nationalstaat*, pp. 218–231.)

adequate form, in which respect for individual rights and historical diversity made Switzerland the one enduring democratic nation-state among the modern political creations of the German-, French-, and Italian-speaking peoples.

— 8 —

PESTALOZZI

NONE expressed the spirit of this Swiss nationalism better than Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi (1746–1827). In the dark months which followed the defeat of Napoleon, amidst all the uncertainties about the future, he appealed 'An die Unschuld, den Ernst und den Edelmut meines Zeitalters und meines Vaterlandes.' He had known the great hopes which the French Revolution had aroused and its rapid deterioration under the influence of state absolutism and national glorification. He clung to the individualism and humanitarianism of the original vision: 'Tell me, fatherland: was it not the will of the people, the confidence of the people and free elections, which founded Switzerland? Was not its middle class, its freedom and its sense of legality, and the attention paid to it by all civic authorities, the source of all our blessings? . . . Among our fathers, concord has never been forced upon the people by hypocrisy or punishment; with God's help it will remain so. My fatherland, you will not tolerate that force rules over law in some corner of the country and that lawlessness be legally sanctioned by the concentration of all powers in the egoism of one power. You who work for the regeneration of our constitution which has been our blessed heritage for centuries, you will not wish that, as a result of constitutional changes, one man or one village or one class in our country becomes deprived of its rights. Concord cannot be established by unity, unity must be established by concord. I praise you, my fatherland, because you do not wish to force the different parts into a unity which for that very reason could never become blissful or real and that you wish to achieve the blissful strength of outward unity only through inward concord. . . . No, fatherland, not the sword—no, the light! Light about yourself, deep under-

standing of the evil which lodges within you against yourself, that is what you need.'[1] In 1798 Pestalozzi had written 'Der Mench ist eher Mensch als Bürger' (First of all Man is Man, then only is he a Citizen).[2] In 1815, summing up his experiences of the twenty years of the Revolution and of Napoleon, he repeated his warning: 'Lasst uns Menschen werden, damit wir wieder Bürger, damit wir wieder Staaten werden können, und nicht durch Unmenschlichkeit zur Unfähigkeit des Bürgersinns und durch Unfähigkeit zum Bürgersinn zur Auflösung aller Staatskraft, in welcher Form es auch immer geschehe, versinken!' (Let us become human beings in order that we may again live as citizens and that we may form states; inhumanity will make us incapable of being citizens and thus will destroy the true foundation of a state's existence.)

[1] *Pestalozzi's Sämtliche Schriften* (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1920), vol. VI, pp. 6 ff. 'Sage mir Vaterland, wodurch ist die Schweiz gregründet worden als durch den Volkswillen, durch das Volksvertrauen und durch die Volkswahl? Und worin lag die Quelle aller seiner Vorzüge und alles seines Segens als in seinem Mittelstand, im freien Spielraum und im reinen, hohen Rechtsgefuhl desselben, und in der Aufmerksamkeit aller bürgerlichen Gewalten auf denselben? . . . Mein Vaterland, du wirst dieses nicht dulden: Du wirst in deiner heutigen Stunde weniger als je dulden, dass in irgend einem Winkel deiner Lande die Gewalt verfassungsmässig über das Recht herrsche, und dass das Unrecht der Gesetzlosigkeit sich durch Vereinigung aller Gewalten in die Selbstsucht einer einzigen gesetzlich sanktioniere.

'Edle Männer, die ihr am Werk der Erneuerung unserer seit Jahrhunderten gesegneten Verfassung des Landes arbeitet, ihr seid ferne davon, dass irgend ein Mann im Schweizerland durch die Folgen der Abänderung unserer Verfassung ein rechtloser Mann, und irgend ein Dorf im Schweizerland ein rechtloses Dorf, und irgend ein Stand im Land ein rechtloser Stand, und irgend eine Tugend eine rechtlose und dadurch eine entehrte, eine entweihte, eine kraftlose Tugend werde.

'Die Eintracht kann nicht durch die Einheit, die Einheit muss durch die Eintracht herbeigeführt werden. Vaterland, ich lobe dich sehr, dass du die Einheit deiner Staatsteile nicht gewaltsam in eine segenslose und innerlich ganz uneinige Einheit hineinzwingen wolltest, dass du nur auf dem Weg der innern Eintracht zu der Segenskraft der äussern Einheit gelangen willst, gelangen sollst und gelangen kannst. . . . Nein, Vaterland, nicht das Schwert—nein, nein das Licht! Licht über dich selbst, tiefe Erkenntnis der Übel, die gegen dich selbst in dir liegen, das ist das, was dir not tut.'

[2] Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, *Sämliche Briefe*, vol. IV: Briefe aus den Jahren 1798 bis Mitte 1805, ed. by Emanuel Dejung *et al.* (Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1951).

Without any illusion, Pestalozzi analysed society and the way in which social interests and political power abuse moral concepts.[1] Civil power has, according to Pestalozzi, as its chief purpose the 'constitutional safeguard of the citizen from the unlawful usurpation of power by supreme authority, be this authority called King, Parliament or National Convention.' Yet in spite of the fact that civil power can serve a good end by protecting civil liberty, the power of the state is always the potential enemy of civil liberty because human nature tends to domination. All forms of government, Pestalozzi maintained, are subject to corruption by their trend towards more power; only the strength of the moral freedom of the individual can limit the danger or the abuse of power and can protect civil liberty and individual independence (*Freiheit und Selbständigkeit*). Thus all social organizations, from the family to the state, are determined by the quality of the individuals which compose them. Pestalozzi knew, as Plato and Rousseau had taught before him, the close interrelationship between education and politics. But Pestalozzi, alone among the three great educators, stressed the individual, not the interests of the community, as the true foundation of education and of political life. His refusal to idolize state and society, and his concentration upon the individual, brought him to emphasize education for the poor classes. The aristocrat, the member of an élite, could be trusted to develop, through heritage and tradition, sufficient independence of mind and heart to maintain his liberty against encroachments of authority. The poor, on the other hand, the disinherited of the ages, were without proper education susceptible to succumb to the blandishments or means of coercion of governments. The education of the poor to a sense of civic

[1] See Hans Barth, 'Über den Schweizerischen Beitrag zur Staatsphilosophie, erläutert an Werken Pestalozzis,' in *Philosophie in der Schweiz* (Erlenbach-Zürich: Rentsch, 1946), pp. 51–73. Pestalozzi's political and ethical views can be found in his 'Nachforschungen über den Gang der Natur in der Entwicklung des Menschengeschlechts' (1797), *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by L. W. Seyffarth, 12 vols. (Liegnitz: C. Seyffarth, 1899–1902), vol. VII, pp. 385–519. While Rousseau regarded nature and civilization as irreconcilable, Pestalozzi sought their harmony through education.

liberty and individual independence was therefore education's primary task.[1]

Fichte, in his *Addresses to the German Nation*, favoured the application of Pestalozzi's educational methods, because he was convinced that any group educated in that way would become a superior group. But there was a fundamental difference between the two men: Fichte intended to use the method for nationalist purposes, for raising the spiritual and moral forces of the Germans above all other nations; Pestalozzi stressed the elevation of the poor, their education to independent individuals. These individuals had to be stern in mind and character and body, to be able to resist the influences of collective forces—for that reason Pestalozzi recommended physical education in elementary schools. Father Jahn, followed by other nationalists, took up Pestalozzi's method as Fichte did; but like Fichte he shifted the whole emphasis. He organized gymnastic exercises in order to increase the collective strength and military preparedness of the nation. Pestalozzi abhorred any absolutist claims of the nation or the state; in 1818 he strongly rejected the statement that children do not belong to the parents but to the state. 'But no, my fellow citizens, our children still belong to us, praise the Lord, and through us, and only through us, to the fatherland, to the state.' The statement that children belong to the state meant according to Pestalozzi 'nothing less than that man must recognize the demands of his collective existence (*seiner kollektiven Existenz*) as the highest duty and the supreme authority.' Pestalozzi poured his whole scorn over those who upheld the precedence of the collective group over the individual. Such a statement, he wrote, means that 'the collective life of one's kind is everything, one's individuality and its rights are nothing. It says nothing less than that man must sacrifice his individuality and its sacred rights to the collective existence of the group, and let the latter determine the time and place and manner of this sacrifice! . . . That is too much! That is too much!'[2]

[1] See Hans Barth, *Pestalozzis Philosophie der Politik* (Erlenbach-Zürich: Rentsch, 1954).

[2] *Sämtliche Werke*, ed. by Seyffarth, vol. XII, p. 102 f.

Pestalozzi was in 1798 one of the most fervent supporters of the French Revolution; he approved of its influence on Switzerland through the Helvetic Republic. Soon, however, he came to ask himself how it was possible that the Revolution which had proclaimed the inalienable rights of man and citizen had led to their being disregarded by an authoritarian power greater than that of the absolutist kings. Had it not become possible by the fact that the individuals themselves acclaimed Napoleon, that they adored success and approved national power and glory? Napoleon, Pestalozzi recognized, 'did not obtain his following or his power by means of his sword but by the force of his genius (*seine Geisteskraft*). This genius irresistibly seized upon the weakness of his contemporaries. . . . He was the soul and the life-force of all the lusts for power of his day. He aroused them everywhere, among princes and officials as well as in the taverns, with greater artistic skill and strength than perhaps at any time since the beginning of the world.'[1] Pestalozzi believed that Napoleon represented forces at work in every human soul, but raised to a demoniac and exemplary potency. Therefore Napoleon attracted so many men away from liberty and independence to reliance upon collective forces. For man, as a natural and as a social being, inclines towards collectivity and this inclination hardens his egoistic urge and his cult of violence. But Pestalozzi was convinced that there is in the individual a potential faculty for liberty, for a self-reliant and autonomous existence which enables him to resist the temptations of his natural being and of society. True civic education, according to Pestalozzi, has to develop that faculty of individual liberty, an educational goal opposed to that of

[1] Quoted in Hans Barth, 'Ueber die Staatslehre Pestalozzis,' *Neue Schweizer Rundschau*, March 1948, p. 668. Pestalozzi recognized that Napoleon also brought good results. 'The good which he brought about is new, while the evil which he did to us, both in its means and in its essence, has long been in our midst, very long. And even worse, we show as little inclination to abolish this old evil, which he did not create but only strongly revitalized among us, as we do to elevate the true and the good, which he brought to those states which knew how to use it, into actual service for us by testing and purifying it.' Pestalozzi and the Swiss turned the experience of Napoleon into constructive channels, while some German intellectuals tried to outbid him in his self-destructive trends.

collectivists and nationalists. Pestalozzi, saw in a nation or a state only an aggregate of individuals, and the character of this aggregate was determined by the character of the individuals which compose it; therefore a state which promotes the individuality and autonomy of its citizens assures the strongest and most enduring basis for its own existence. Nations like Switzerland, Britain and the United States, which value individual liberty and tolerance of diversity highest, have developed the securest foundation for their nationhood. For Switzerland none expressed this political philosophy more consistently than Pestalozzi. It was this philosophy which helped Switzerland to emerge successfully from the turmoil of the third and fourth decades of the nineteenth century.

— 9 —

THE REGENERATION OF SWISS NATIONALISM AND LIBERTY

AS Pestalozzi had foreseen the restoration period was of short duration. The ideas of 1789 germinated in Switzerland, as all over Europe after 1815, and received a new inspiration from the Parisian July days of 1830. In Switzerland as in England, the French events of that year accelerated a long existing development. They did not bring new ideas or programmes; they did not present a revolutionary break; for the situation in England and Switzerland differed from that in France: no charter or constitutional promises had been violated, no monarch and no ministry had usurped unlawful functions. But the show of strength which liberal France made in those three hot summer days, the ease with which the reactionary government of the last Bourbon king collapsed, the rather bloodless and orderly transition which paved the way to a modernization of society and to the ascent of the middle classes to power, strengthened the liberal trends in England and in the more populous and economically more progressive Swiss cantons.[1] In Zürich and in

[1] A. E. Cherbuliez, *op. cit.*, vol. I, p. 67, wrote about the influence of the French Revolution of 1830 in Switzerland: 'Pour se rendre raison de l'influence qu'a exercée en Suisse la révolution française, il faut faire abstraction de son but et de ses résultats, très-étrangers, certes, aux movements qui s'operèrent bientôt après dans les cantons. . . . C'est par ses moyens, non par son but, que la révolution de juillet fut contagieuse pour nous. La Suisse n'y puisa aucune theorie nouvelle, aucune doctrine politique dont elle ne fut déjà en possession. . . . Mais les journées de juillet donnèrent aux peuples l'exemple séduisant d'une insurrection motivée sur le droit, accompli avec autant de moderation que d'héroisme et couronnée d'un éclatant succès. Un peuple s'était levé en masse et spontanément pour la défense de ses libertés; il avait lutté corps à corps pendant trois jours avec ses oppresseurs; il avait triomphé sans souiller sa victorie d'aucun désordre, d'aucun crime attentatoire à la morale publique ou aux droits individuels!'

other cities industrialization and increased trade brought greater wealth and confidence to artisans and farmers.[1] The ideas of the Enlightenment inspired their desire for 'regeneration' and their faith in democracy; under this impulse several cantons in 1831 introduced democratic constitutions based upon the sovereignty of the people. Thanks to the leadership of Thomas Bornhauser (1799–1856), a Protestant pastor in Matzingen, Thurgau became the first canton to receive a 'regenerated' constitution. Zürich, Berne, St. Gallen, Vaud and other cantons followed quickly.[2] The new constitutions were submitted to a popular referendum; they guaranteed the rights of the individual and they introduced modern educational systems, crowned in the cases of Zürich and Berne by the establishment of universities. In 1838 a referendum in the canton of Zürich abolished the last remaining trace of the traditional precedence of the city over the countryside. A revised Bernese constitution of 1846, which owed much to the radical leaders Ulrich Ochsenbein (1811–1890) and Jakob Stämpfli (1820–1879), strengthened Berne's liberal leadership in the Confederation, a complete reversal of the position of 1815 when Berne headed the conservative reaction.

The events of 1830 deepened the social and ideological differences between Western Europe on the one hand, and Central and Eastern Europe on the other hand. The failure of the liberal revolutions of 1830 in Italy, Germany and Poland only increased the weakness of liberalism there. Some Swiss historians thought that the multiplicity of cantons which could experiment in different ways with constitutional reform and civic education helped the victory of liberalism in Switzerland. But a similar multiplicity of states existed also in Italy and Germany. The different development has more fundamental causes. The liberals

[1] See Walther Rupli, *Zollreform und Bundesreform in der Schweiz 1815–1848* (Zürich: Europa Verlag, 1950).

[2] See Otto Frei, *Die geistige Welt Thomas Bornhausers* (Frauenfeld: Huber, 1951); Richard Feller, *Berns Verfassungskämpfe 1846* (Berne: Herbert Lang, 1948); Werner Näf, 'Staatsverfassungen und Staatstypen 1830–31,' *Schweizer Beiträge zur allgemeinen Geschichte*, vol. III (1945), pp. 179–204; Anton v. Muralt, *Die Julirevolution und die Regeneration in der Schweiz* (Affoltern: J. Weiss, 1948).

in Italy, Germany and Poland put national unity and power above individual liberty, or as Pestalozzi called it, outward and enforced unity above inward concord. Nothing comparable to the expansionist ambitions of Sardinia or Prussia, to Mazzini's unitarianism, to German claims to German borderlands or Polish claims to Ukrainian and Lithuanian soil existed in Switzerland. The Swiss achieved constitutional liberty first, and only through its strength found later closer national unity. They had to fight for it, not against 'alien' governments, but like seventeenth-century England or the United States in the following two centuries, in a civil war, in a struggle for the interpretation of the Constitution and for the affirmation and broadening of individual liberty. No romantic nationalism, longing for a Third Rome, a new Reich, a Polonia magna, troubled Swiss minds, nor did they believe in the ethical primacy or the messianic destiny of their people. Though the Swiss achieved democratic liberty and federal unity without foreign help and without wars against foreign powers, their struggle for nationhood was not only a national concern: as in the civil wars in the United States, men of foreign descent participated prominently in the Swiss conflict between 'Tories' and 'Whigs.'

In 1832 the Swiss 'Whigs'—liberals, democrats and radicals of varying shades—were in control of the majority of the population in the Confederation, but not of the majority of the cantons. The Confederation as a whole continued in its old form of a loose alliance of tiny sovereign states, jealous of their independence. Some cantons resisted any change; but the majority of the Diet decided in July 1832, upon the suggestion of Eduard Pfyffer of Lucerne (1782–1834), to appoint a commission of fifteen for the revision of the Federal Pact. Its highly capable members were divided, as were the cantons, which they represented, about the desirability and the extent of such a revision. On the one side were the radical reformers led by Conrad Melchior Hirzel (1795–1845) of Zürich and Jacob Gallus Baumgartner (1797–1869) of St. Gallen; on the other side Frederic de Chambrier (1785–1856) of Neuchâtel and Cosmus Heer (1790–1837) of Glarus sought to

maintain the existing pact; a centre group was represented by Pfyffer and Charles Monnard (1790–1850) of Vaud, then a professor of French literature and journalist in Lausanne, who translated Johannes Müller's *History of Switzerland* into French and who in 1845 became professor of Romance languages in Bonn. The chairman of the commission was Count Pellegrino Rossi (1787–1848), a native of Carrara, an Italian liberal and professor of law in Bologna. In 1815 he had supported the efforts of Joachim Murat, Napoleon's appointee as King of Naples, to unify Italy, and after Murat's failure he had to flee to Geneva where he became a citizen and professor of law. He exercised the greatest influence on the project for the revision of the Swiss Pact; none expressed better the newly rising spirit of Swiss nationalism than this native Italian who very soon thereafter left Switzerland to become a French citizen and who after a distinguished career as professor of constitutional law became in 1845 French ambassador to Rome, and three years later was appointed minister of interior in the Papal reform administration and fell victim to the aroused passions of that year. His career testifies to the generous vagueness of the national consciousness even among the 'nationalists' themselves in the first half of the nineteenth century.

Rossi had a deep understanding for the continuing strength of the idea of cantonal sovereignty in the early 1830's. Swiss national consciousness had not yet grown to the overwhelming feeling of a common Swiss nationality. The revised pact which the commission proposed and which became known as the Pact Rossi, maintained the sovereignty of the cantons; yet in his report Rossi, asking whether the idea of a Swiss nationality had no place in the thinking of the Swiss people, answered out of an acute sense of sympathy for the growth of Swiss nationalism: 'Such an assertion would be rejected by an outcry of indignation. The Swiss fatherland—it too has a place in our heart. The name Swiss alone suffices to prove it; in itself it represents an important national fact. Who are we outside our homes, which name do we claim, of which name are we proud, which history do we recall,

which is the name of our flag, of our soldiers, of their loyalty, of their courage? Swiss. This word dominates all our diversities of language, habits, religion and economy; with all the ideas which accompany it, it soars above the local traditions or, to express it better, it absorbs them. It alone is for us in our language the true antithesis of foreigner. It stamps upon us the ineffaceable mark of common nationality. . . .

'Yes, the idea of a common fatherland is not alien to us; the sentiment of nationality exists in our hearts. Whatever the vilifiers of modern times may say, it is one of the glories of our epoch, that this idea has gained in clearness and that this sentiment has gained in energy. Everything reveals to us this memorable progress; the words and the writings, the national festivals and the literary and learned societies, the wishes and projects of many cantons, and even this very anxiety, this general uneasiness which it is impossible not to recognize, and this hope that the remedy to the evils which beset the fatherland must be found in a new Pact, in a strong Confederation.'

The project was debated the following year in the Diet, but it was rejected in spite of the fact that it suggested Lucerne as the permanent seat of the Diet, in order to win the Catholic cantons for the reform. Nevertheless the question whether the Federal Pact should be revised, partly or totally, by the Diet or by a nationally elected Constituent Assembly, continued to agitate Switzerland. Could the Pact be revised otherwise than by unanimous agreement of all the twenty-two sovereign members which of their own will had entered into this eternal alliance? The country was deeply divided over these issues and for fifteen years lived in a mood approaching civil war, aggravated by the fact that the constitutional quarrels were deepened by sharp cantonal differences in religion, ideology and economic structure. On the whole, the urban Protestant cantons were democratic and for a radical revision of the Pact; the rural Catholic cantons and the linguistic minorities clung to the Pact and their sovereignty as the best guarantee of their way of life and their traditional rights. The question of national unity was, as in the United States, not

simply a problem of state-rights against the growing federal power; the passions were fanned by ideological prejudices and economic fears. The dividing line was for a long time not clearly drawn and some of the cantons changed their position during the period. But the three rural cantons which were the cradle of the Confederation and the guardians of its original Pact, were throughout the irreconcilable leaders in the struggle against any reform. In the later Middle Ages they were regarded as the outstanding example of revolutionary peasantry; now they regarded themselves as a rock of opposition against the Reformation and the Revolution. They upheld their ancient liberties with the same tenacity against modern nationalism and middle-class ideas, with which they had upheld them against the feudal lords of the Middle Ages.

The growing Swiss national sentiment was expressed with unusual warmth and insight not only by the Italian Rossi but also by the German Heinrich Zschokke. After 1802 Zschokke became the leader of the liberal patriots in the canton Aargau. Like Rossi, he worked for the revision of the constitution and for a closer national Swiss tie; like Rossi, he did not believe in force to achieve the goal but relied upon education and the growth of a Swiss national consciousness. 'Education had to mature the people to an understanding and a realization of the liberal ideas of a new form of society. The liberal state should not be forced upon the people, it should emanate from the people itself.'[1] He

[1] Paul Schaffroth, "Heinrich Zschokke als Politiker und Publizist während der Restauration und Regeneration,' *Argovia*, Jahresschrift der historischen Gesellschaft des Kantons Aargau, vol. 61 (Aarau: Sauerländer, 1949), p. 89. Among the many books which Zschokke wrote (his *Gesammelte Schriften* appeared in Aarau 1851–1854 in 35 vols.) were *Der Helvetische Genius* (2 Stücke, Zürich 1799), *Historische Denkwürdigkeiten der helvetischen Staatsumwälzung* (3 vols., Winterthur, 1803–1805), *Geschichte des Freystaates der Drey Bünde im hohen Rhätien* (2nd ed., Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1817). Most popular was his *Des Schweizerlandes Geschichten für das Schweizervolk* (Aarau, 1822). A French translation by Charles Monnard, *Histoire de la Nation Suisse*, appeared in Aarau and Geneva in 1825. Immediately after the death of the author appeared an eighth edition (Achte vermehrte Originalausgabe, mit Fortsetzung der neuern Geschichte von Emil Zschokke, Aarau: Sauerländer, 1849).

fought for these ideas in his newspaper which he called *De aufrichtige und wohlerfahrene Schweizer Bote* (*The Sincere and Well-Experienced Swiss Messenger*); he wrote a popular history for the Swiss people *Des Schweizerlandes Geschichte für das Schweizervolk*, which appeared in 1849 in its eighth printing, and he propagated the creation of a Swiss university. 'We must arouse a Swiss national spirit,' an article of his proclaimed in his paper of February 3, 1820. 'All Swiss must become known to each other and akin in their interests, hearts and minds. It is not enough that the governments of the twenty-two cantons be on good terms in the true spirit of confederates, for all governments consist only of a few persons. A Swiss national spirit must live in the peoples themselves. . . . If the peoples are animated by such a spirit, the governments receive it automatically, but it does not work the other way round. . . . The cantonal schools educate mostly only cantonal citizens and thus produce a one-sided and lame local patriotism and not a Swiss consciousness. The young people who then go to foreign universities, become lifelong friends of their German fellow-students rather than of Swiss youth, and bring home more of German than of Swiss mentality.'[1]

In the years before 1830 Zschokke helped to prepare the liberal regeneration of his canton; after 1831 he strove incessantly for national unity. He concluded his *History of Switzerland* with a warning against cantonal separation: 'Not from Germany, not from abroad comes the enemy before whom the Swiss heart should quail. The most formidable adversary of our freedom and independence, when he comes, will appear in our midst. But he must bear a mark by which everyone may know him: it is he who prefers the honour of his own canton to the everlasting glory of the whole Confederacy, his own personal or family advantage to the public good. It is he who would rend asunder the unity and grandeur of the Confederacy, and with the purple tatters of a divided majesty bedeck the dwarfed proportions of cantonal self-sovereignty. . . . So shall the holy cause of the fatherland be the holy cause of every cabin and a God-like public

[1] Schaffroth, *op. cit.*, p. 111 f.

spirit, like a celestial fire, consume all personal and cantonal selfishness.'[1] Zschokke, a liberal and humanitarian, nevertheless sounded differently from Pestalozzi. He wrote at a time when the new nationalism threatened to plunge Switzerland into bitter civil wars. Yet in the end Swiss moderation and common sense restored that balance between local tradition and federal unity, between individual and nation, based upon respect for autonomy and diversity, which formed the basis of Pestalozzi's educational and political philosophy.

[1] Zschokke, *The History of Switzerland, op. cit.*, p. 308 f. In 1818 Zschokke published an article 'Europas Niedergang—Amerikas Aufgang,' which ended: 'From now on America shall be the home of human culture and the beacon of the globe, towards which the sages of all countries will look with longing in grateful blessings.' (*Ausgewählte Schriften*, vol. X, Aarau, 1825, p. 322.)

— 10 —

SWITZERLAND AS A EUROPEAN MODEL

ROSSI and Zschokke identified themselves with Switzerland; this was, however, not the case with the refugees whom the failure of the nationalist revolutions in Italy, Poland and Germany in 1831 sent to the Swiss asylum. Though, in their grandiloquent way, these refugees liked to regard themselves as pilgrims of liberty, they thought much less of Switzerland than of their own nation, which remained to them the centre, and in many cases the leader, of the universe. Their most famous representative, the Italian Mazzini, spoke and wrote incessantly for 'the only idea I believe to have power to resuscitate the People—the idea of Nationality—and for the initiative influence of Italy in the coming movement.' Characteristically enough he opposed the liberal French Revolution of 1789—primarily because he thought the French people incapable of a true regeneration—and centred all his hopes on the very three peoples, among whom national power aspirations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were to defeat liberalism, the Italians, Germans and Poles. 'There are in Europe three families,' Mazzini wrote, 'the Hellenic-Latin, the German, and the Slavonic: and Italy, Germany and Poland may be regarded as the representatives of these three families.' The Western nations, with their infinitely more secure liberal tradition, France and England, were haughtily disregarded by Mazzini as the representatives of the Latin and Germanic 'families.' In republishing the article in 1862 Mazzini added, however, a note concerning the Slavonic family: 'The revival of Russia has surpassed all my expectations. . . . Nevertheless, I still believe that the restoration of Poland will exercise a greater and more direct influence over the organization of the various branches of

the Slavonic family.' Under Mazzini's leadership, the three 'representative' peoples, the Italians, Poles and Germans, took the initiative in forming a committee of Young Europe in Berne on April 15, 1834. A little later Mazzini founded 'Young Switzerland' and the following year he began to publish *La Jeune Suisse*, a journal printed in French and in German in Bienne in the canton Berne. Several of his articles tried to educate Swiss public opinion: 'Upon the necessity of a Constituent Assembly' demanded such an assembly for Switzerland, while 'Neutrality' declared that a great European war of principles was approaching and that the Swiss must take sides and participate in it, otherwise they would have to face their own destruction and lose their honour.[1] Mazzini's writings made little impression upon the Swiss, but his military activities and plots directed against Sardinia turned Switzerland into a centre of international revolution and provoked energetic steps by the conservative powers. France joined them because the canton Thurgau harboured Prince Louis Napoleon whom King Louis Philippe distrusted and feared. Only England abstained from intervention; it was in England that most of the political exiles, among them Mazzini, found a refuge, when they had to leave Switzerland.

The presence of these many political refugees complicated the internal Swiss debate. The Swiss radicals and liberals sympathized with the refugees and wished to protect them, while the conservative circles sided with the Holy Alliance and the forces of order. The frequent interventions by the neighbouring Great Powers revealed the military and political weakness of a divided Switzerland. The great debate between radicals and clericals, between liberals and conservatives, between a progressive industrial economy and a traditionally agrarian society, which went on all over the European continent in the 1840's, nowhere found such a vivid expression as in the free atmosphere of Switzerland. For several years the country seemed to lack the sense of moderation and sobriety which usually has characterized

[1] *Life and Writings* of Joseph Mazzini, new ed. (London: Smith, Elder & Co., 1891) vol. III, pp. 5, 17.

its people. The conflicts which came to a head on the European continent between 1848 and 1852 were anticipated, fought out and solved in Switzerland by the beginning of 1848. Elsewhere on the European continent the Liberal forces suffered defeat during that period; in Switzerland they triumphed. They achieved this victory with the minimum of violence and used it with the maximum of moderation, in spite of the rare bitterness of the preceding disputes and discussions. Their work, the creation of a Swiss nation on the basis of democracy and federation, was the only lasting achievement of the European stormy year of 1848.

— 11 —

GOTTHELF AND BURCKHARDT

THE division of liberals and conservatives in Switzerland did not coincide with that between Protestants and Catholics. Many leading Protestants opposed the new spirit of radicalism. Among them was the great patriotic priest Albert Bitzius (1797–1854), who from 1832 on was pastor in Lützelflüh in the Emmenthal in the canton of Berne. He became better known by his pen-name, Jeremias Gotthelf, taken from his extremely popular novel, *Bauernspiegel oder Lebensgeschichte des Jeremias Gotthelf von ihm selbst berichtet* (1837). Gotthelf first supported the liberal movement, but soon turned against it. He saw in the conservative peasantry and its love of hearth and home the bulwark of Swiss liberty and nationhood, a way of life endangered and corrupted by industrial civilization. In some essential ways he resembled his Danish counterpart, the nationalist priest and poet N. F. S. Grundtvig. As a man and a writer, Gotthelf served and expressed two very different forces: a Christian piety and morality, rigorous and self-assertive, which knew little of humility and tolerance, and a pre-Christian proud attachment to the hallowed gods of rugged ancestors and ragged soil. Like an Old Testament prophet, he exalted and exhorted his people and wished to call them back to the ways of the past. He called Switzerland a mountain fastness the liberty of which God had protected throughout the centuries. In his famous address *Eines Schweizers Wort an den Schweizerischen Schützenverein 1842* (*The Word of a Swiss Man to the Swiss Sharpshooters' Association in 1842*) he extolled the national spirit which the Swiss sharpshooters showed in their yearly reunions. These meetings, held in different Swiss cities, represented one of the rare manifestations of Swiss nationality, of a common loyalty above those divisions in cantons, religions and parties that determined the everyday life and political thought of the Swiss.

Gotthelf praised the sharpshooters for carrying on the work which the Helvetic Society had started in 1761. The *Helvetische Gessellschaft*, 'that most precious jewel of our land, unsurpassed in its values even by the most brilliant inventions of the human mind,' had set the example for similar patriotic associations in Switzerland and throughout Europe. Its membership, however, was confined to men concerned with scholarship or the arts; the sharpshooters' associations united the people itself with the help of the rifle, which each Swiss cherished as a guardian of his liberty. In Switzerland alone, Gotthelf proudly noticed, a whole people could meet, each one armed with his rifle, unguarded and unpoliced, in cheerful liberty, and yet keep order and decorum, without being feared or suspected by governments or authorities. These yearly sharpshooters' meetings started in the 1820's and developed into the only visible manifestation of the Swiss longing for national unity. In these meetings Gotthelf, therein a true disciple of Rousseau, found 'the feeling of fraternity which lives in the people even when its leaders are divided, the certainty that the people in its true essence stands above all parties, that the newspapers which like to call themselves representative of public opinion and are full of disputes and vituperations, are only sewers through which all the unclean waters are drained, while the people remain in its purity, a truly virile people, in which everyone is conscious that he carries in his hand the security and the honour of his fatherland.'

Gotthelf welcomed these yearly meetings not only as a manifestation of the longing for Swiss unity, but also as a symbol of fraternal equality. The Swiss alone could establish fraternity and bridge the gulf separating castes and classes elsewhere, 'without Chartist horrors and without Communist dreams.' The Swiss, Gotthelf was convinced, would not succumb to the 'dreadful' phenomena of modern mass-society—Chartism and Communism —for they differed from all other peoples by the fact 'that [their] strength resides in the individual and that every individual's cradle is the home, whereas other nations seek strength in the masses, and the power of the masses rests in their size and amalgamation.

There, no one cares about the individual.' The revolutionary movements of the masses in modern times, Gotthelf charged, try to cover this neglect of the individual by calling it 'individual liberty,' an unchristian doctrine, the very opposite of brotherly love and moral earnestness, a doctrine especially widespread in the United States. In Switzerland, on the other hand, 'the single individual is the centre of importance and the goal; if each man will be a right man by himself, then the people as a whole will be the right people.'[1]

Gotthelf grew more and more into a passionate partisan of the traditional values of family, fatherland, honour and work, and rejected the new liberalism as something alien to the good old Swiss way of life. He went so far as to break with his Berlin publisher, Julius Springer (1817–1877), when the latter fought on the barricades in March 1848. Gotthelf was full of the darkest forebodings about a coming catastrophic age and voiced his forebodings with the rudeness of an angry prophet. In his *Dr. Dorbach, der Wühler und die Bürglenherren* (1849) he calls the radicals 'fremde Fötzel und Halunken,' who try to sell as liberty a concoction brewed from their own human imperfections and vices, 'ein Garn, gezwirnt aus Ungenügen, Unzufriedenheit, Bosheit und Lüge, geschmiert mit dem allerneuestern Ichtum und grober Fleischeslust.' In *Zeitgeist und Berner Geist* (1851) Gotthelf wrote the sharpest and most famous Swiss rejection of modern times.[2]

[1] Jeremias Gotthelf, *Eines Schweizers Wort an den Schweizerischen Schützenverein*—originally Solothurn, 1844, reprinted Lucerne: Erasmus Verlag, n.d. 1945?): 'Unser Vaterland ist des Herrn Feste, seine eigener Blick hat es geweiht zu seinem eigenen Lande, und mit selbsteigener Hand hat er es behütet' (p. 6). 'Noch ist dem Schweizer die Freiheit sein höchstes irdisches Gut, . . . und darum liebt er auch und ehret, was sie ihm soll wahren helfen . . . seine Waffe. . . . In dieser Waffe liegt zugleich etwas Geheimnisreiches, Wunderbares, welches zu jeder Zeit seine besondere Gewalt üben wird über der Menschen Gemüter; ein fernes Ziel zu treffen, den Tod in die Weite zu senden mit sicherer Hand, dass das erzielte Opfer fällt, wie vom Blitz aus gottes Hand getroffen, unerwartet und ohne Abwehr, hat etwas Götterhaftes' (p. 19). See also pp. 25, 43.

[2] New edition by H. Bloesch (Erlenbach-Zürich: Rentsch, 1926). See also Karl Fehr, *Priestertum und Innerlichkeit Jeremias Gotthelfs, dargestellt am 'Druiden'* (Frauenfeld: Huber, 1952).

Gotthelf's pessimism about the new democratic society was shared by the famous Basle historian, Jakob Burckhardt (1818–1897). Both were out of tune with the dominant trend of their time, but there were marked differences between them: Gotthelf was rooted like a patriarch in the intimate knowledge of his village and mountains; he hardly left Switzerland and he proudly set the slow growth and the slow ways of his native land against all the amenities and the glorious arts of the outside world; as a fierce religious prophet and a zealous national educator he burned with the desire to guide his people; Burckhardt, on the other hand, was an aristocratic individual and a classical humanist, rooted in the urban patriciate; though he lived in his native Basle for the last fifty-three years of his life, his love first belonged to Germany, then to Italy, and the scholarship and the art of these two foreign countries exercised the greatest influence upon him; retiring more and more from all public life, he had no desire to lead or educate the Swiss nation.

When, at the age of twenty-one, Burckhardt left Basle and the study of theology to go to Germany as a student of history and the arts, the young man, whose later life was to be one of sobriety and resignation, became imbued with the spirit of a romantic enthusiasm for Germany. 'Often I wish to kneel down before the sacred German soil and to thank God that I speak German' (Ich möchte oft vor dieser heiligen deutschen Erde auf die Knie sinken und Gott danken, dass ich deutsche Sprache rede!), he wrote on April 5, 1841, to his sister Louise. After his return to Basle in 1844, he felt deeply disappointed with the political and cultural life in his fatherland and even played with the idea of expatriation. He still believed in the closest union with Germany; a Swiss nationality appeared to him hardly possible, and he had no desire for separating Switzerland from Germany and to follow the example of the Netherlands, which had become independent from the great German nation with which formerly they had been united by political and linguistic ties.[1]

[1] Burckhardt wrote on May 3, 1845: 'Immer mehr verbreitet sich, wenn auch nur im Stillen, unter den höher gebildeten und denkenden, deutsch redenden

In the last years before 1848, Burckhardt feared, and bitterly opposed, the radical trends which were then much more vocal in Switzerland than anywhere else on the Continent. At the same time Basle appeared to him narrow and philistine beyond endurance. On September 11, 1846, when the splendour of Berlin had given way to the lure of Italy, he wrote to his German friend Gottfried Kinkel (1815–1862): 'Basel . . . sieht mich so langweilig und philiströs an, dass ich meinem Herrgott selbst für einen Winter in Berlin sehr dankbar bin. Nein, unter diesen Geldprotzen hält es kein rechter Mensch aus! Rom! Rom! Rom! capisce?' (Basle is so boring and philistine that I would be very grateful to God even for a winter in Berlin. No real man can stand life here among these purse-proud men. O, Rome.) Above all he was concerned with the dark future of Switzerland and Europe, which he believed was approaching as a result of the rise of the mass-man. 'This dreadful uproar (*dieser heillose Lärm*),' he wrote on January 26, 1846, 'this misplaced publicity, these wicked parties and their struggle, which force men against their

Schweizern das Gefühl der Zusammengehörigkeit, der innern ursprünglichen Einheit mit Deutschland, je weniger dieselben sich bei einiger Aufrichtigkeit von dem Dasein einer schweizerischen Nationalität überzeugen können. Sie erkennen es, dass die Schweiz in allen geistigen Beziehungen . . . von dem grossen Herde der Weltgedanken, von Deutschland abhängig ist; sie preisen sich glücklich, dass kein zur Schriftsprache erhobener Dialekt uns von Deutschland trennt, wie etwa Holland; sie ahnen Deutschlands Zukunft und glauben, dieselbe werde vielleicht auch ihre Zukunft sein. . . . Der täuschende Schimmer des politischen Zustandes von Frankreich [attracts] den demokratischen Schweizer, wie die Verfassung keines anderen Nachbarlandes, und in dieser Beziehung denken viele ähnlich von Deutschland, wie man etwa im Elsass davon denkt. Hierin können nur grosse europäische Ereignisse eine wesentliche Aenderung hervorbringen, bei welcher es sich überhaupt entscheiden wird, ob wir wirklich die eine und dieselbe Nation sind mit den Genfern und Tessinern und Romanen, wie fortwährend behauptet wird.' Emil Dürr, *Jacob Burckhardt als politischer Publizist*. Mit seinen Zeitungsberichten aus den Jahren 1844–45. Aus dem Nachlass herausgegeben von Werner Kaegi (Zürich: Fretz & Wasmuth, 1937), p. 116 f. Dürr remarks on p. 167 that such utterances of sympathy for German nationalism were frequent at that period. After 1848 Burckhardt abandoned this Germanophile attitude, partly because Switzerland developed in a less radical way than Burckhardt had feared, and partly because German nationalism under Bismarck had developed in a way which Burckhardt deeply loathed.

will to participate in order to exhaust their strength and their cheerfulness and to throw them into a corner like a squeezed lemon, will drive me eventually out of Switzerland.' Defending his lack of interest in political liberty, he wrote his friends on March 5, 1846: 'You all don't know yet what the people really is (*was Volk ist*) and how easily people can turn into a barbaric mob.' He summed up his apprehensions on April 19, 1849, when he wrote, 'I know too much history to expect from this despotism of the masses anything but a future tyranny.'

These fearful visions haunted Burckhardt not in Berlin, Rome, or St. Petersburg, nor in countries where recently emancipated masses were easily intoxicated in their new desire for power and happiness, because the sobering forces of Western liberalism had not sufficiently taken hold there. The fears haunted him in Switzerland where, as in England and the United States, the tradition of individual liberty and the atmosphere of common sense were strong enough to avert the danger which Burckhardt foresaw in 1848, and to preserve in the following century the spirit of moderation and respect for individual liberty. Burckhardt's attachment to the civilized stillness of the humanist study made him abhor the tumult and the arrogant dynamism of a period of transition; in the few years preceding 1848, even Switzerland seemed to succumb to the gospel of violence and the precedence of the collective over the individual, but it was the passing pain of adolescence, comparable to the seventeenth century in English history; the bitter civil war there, the birth-pangs of a new England, was followed by the Glorious Revolution, the birth-hour of the modern English nation.[1] The birth of the modern Swiss nation follows, two centuries later and in a much quickened

[1] See *The Idea of Nationalism*, pp. 177–183. On Burckhardt, see Werner Kaegi, *Jacob Burckhardt, Eine Biographie*, vol. II (Basle: Benno Schwabe, 1950); Edgar Salin, *Jakob Burckhardt und Nietzsche*, 2nd ed. (Heidelberg: Lambert Schneider, 1948); Emil Dürr, 'Das eidgenössische Schützenfest in Basel 1844 in seiner Beurteilung durch J. Gotthelf, J. Burckhardt und G. Keller,' *Neue Schweizer Rundschau*, Oct. and Nov. 1937, pp. 329–349, 411–428. Jakob Burckhardt's *Briefe*, ed. by Max Burckhardt, vol. II (Basle: Benno Schwabe, 1952), contains his letters from Summer 1843 to March 1846.

development, a similar course: the 1840's were full of bitterness and political and armed strife, in which religious, constitutional and economic antagonisms were inextricably mingled as they had been two hundred years earlier in England; the Swiss 'Glorious Revolution' in 1848 reconciled the bitter adversaries, opened the road to growing democracy and tolerance, and abolished the danger of recurrent revolutions and reactions, as the English Glorious Revolution had done.

— 12 —

THE SWISS CIVIL WAR I

THE constitutional struggle in Switzerland began with the liberal 'regeneration' of some of the larger and economically more dynamic cantons in the 1830's. The conservative peasantry and the old patriciate, uneasy about industry, railroads, and the growing agglomerations of large cities, saw their protection in the traditional stillness and confinement of the sovereign cantons. On the other hand, the liberal forces pressed for greater economic freedom, for the removal of all barriers, for the creation of a unified Swiss nation with one citizenship, one administration, one commercial and tariff policy. This modern conflict was aggravated by the reappearance in the 1840's of a new, and yet in Swiss history very old element. It aligned itself with the existing divisions and deepened them by the memory of former civil wars: the conflict between the Protestant majority and the Catholic minority. The leading Catholic cantons were rural and conservative; they feared the prevailing liberalism of the Protestant cantons and their drive towards Swiss unification, from which they expected a threat to their religious and political traditions. In Switzerland where debates were free, the battle lines between liberalism and conservatism, movement and immobility, were clearly drawn. The liberals regarded themselves as the heirs of the Enlightenment of the eighteenth century during which even Catholic monarchs abolished monasteries, and the Jesuits were expelled from such Catholic countries as Portugal (1759), France (1764), and Spain (1769). Six years later the breve Dominus ac redemptor noster by Pope Clemens XIV suppressed the Society of Jesus. The French Revolution, on the one hand, strengthened the secular trend, but it also put an end to the easy-going scepticism of the eighteenth century. The fanaticism of

unbelief on the European continent produced a renewed bellicosity of the Church, to which the Catholic monarchs now turned for assurance and security. In 1814 the constitution Sollicitudo omnium ecclesiarum of Pope Pius VIII restored the Society of Jesus, which became in the nineteenth century one of the foci in the struggle between the Enlightenment and the Church. In answer to the revolutions of 1830, Pope Gregor XVI in the encyclical Mirari vos rebuked the liberal Catholicism of Lamennais and Lacordaire and with it the liberty of thought and conscience and the freedom of the Press, the very core of the liberal faith.

This growing tension between secularization and faith was reflected in the Swiss political conflicts of the 1840's. In January 1841 the canton Aargau suppressed the religious orders, an act clearly in contradiction to article 12 of the Federal Pact of 1815. The Catholic cantons protested. They were led by Lucerne where in the same year elections replaced the liberal administration, supported mostly by the burghers of the city, with a Catholic conservative administration representing the rural population. The new Government headed by the peasant leader Josef Leu from Ebersol[1] and Constantin Siegwart-Müller (1801–1869) threatened to take a step which it knew to be provocative, though it was clearly legal under the constitution: it invited the Jesuits to Lucerne and entrusted the higher education to them. The Jesuits had been active before in Switzerland, where they had been admitted after 1814 in the Valais, Fribourg and Schwyz. In 1839 Siegwart, editor of the *Schweizer Bundeszeitung* and then still a liberal, had opposed the rising demands for inviting the Jesuits to Lucerne. But the Aargau's suppression of the religious orders, and the refusal of the Protestant cantons to oppose this unconstitutional measure, increased the bitterness on both sides; Siegwart now became one of the foremost advocates of an invitation to the Jesuits. Former leading liberals like Baumgartner of St. Gallen turned conservative Catholics; on the other hand,

[1] Father Leu was assassinated in the political excitement of 1845. See Alois Bernet and Gottfried Boesch, *Josef Leu von Ebersol und seine Zeit* (Lucerne: Rex Verlag, 1945), and E. F. J. Müller, 'Politik aus dem Glauben,' *Schweizer Rundschau*, XLV (1945–1946), pp. 483 ff.

the Lucerne liberals were supported by the radicals in other cantons, who went so far early in 1845 as to organize free corps (*Freischaren*), volunteer legions which invaded the Catholic cantons in order to overthrow their legal governments. These attempts failed. Dr. Jakob Robert Steiger (1801–1862), a physician and leading liberal of Lucerne, who participated in the second free corps expedition, was taken a prisoner by the Lucerne forces, sentenced to death by the Supreme Court of the canton, liberated from prison by his guardians, and received in triumph in Zürich. Switzerland in 1845 seemed torn into two irreconcilable, ideological camps.

Today it is difficult to imagine the immense bitterness displayed on both sides. The religious struggles of the seventeenth century seemed rekindled. Augustin Keller, a leading member of the Aargau legislature and himself a Catholic, moved to ask the Swiss Diet to expel the Jesuits from the whole of Switzerland. 'An der Hand der Religion macht der Jesuit den Menschen zum Tier und zur Furie,' he declared. 'Es ist Pflicht eines jeden Menschenfreundes, gegen dieses Ungetüm aufzutreten' (With the help of religion the Jesuits turn man into a beast and into a fury. . . . It is the duty of every lover of mankind to oppose this monster). Gottfried Keller (1819–1890), Switzerland's greatest poet, printed in 1843 in the first issue of a new periodical, *Die freie Schweiz*, a 'Jesuitenlied.' Its last two verses read:

Von Kreuz und Fahne angeführt,
Den Giftsack hinten aufgeschnürt,
Der Fanatismus ist Profoss,
Die Dummheit folgt als Betteltross,
Sie kommen, die Jesuiten!

O Schweizerland, du schöne Braut,
Du bist dem Teufel angetraut!
Ja, weine nur, du armes Kind!
Vom Gotthard weht ein schlimmer Wind—
Sie kommen, die Jesuiten![1]

[1] Gottfried Keller, *Sämtliche Werke*, Ausgabe auf Grund des Nachlasses, ed. by Jonas Fränkel and Carl Helbling, vol. XIV (Berne: Benteli, 1936) p. 207 Even worse was the 'Pietistenwalzer,' *ibid.*, p. 208. The 'Vaterländische Sonette' III,

The religious rift was widened by the conflict of political ideologies. Both the radicals and the conservatives claimed to speak in the name of liberty: the former understood by it the general rational concept of 1789, the latter the traditional privileges and historical safeguards of personal and corporate autonomy. Both sides appealed to their fellow-believers outside Switzerland; in those days political affinity had a much stronger claim on loyalty in Switzerland than national consciousness.[1] At the same time the Swiss emotionally participated in their neighbours' struggles for national liberty and unity. The people of Tessin sympathized in 1848 with Sardinia and the Italians; the inhabitants of northern and eastern Switzerland waxed enthusiastic for German liberty; the western Swiss followed passionately the revolutionary development in France. Some Swiss were even ready to abandon neutrality in the great European struggle for liberty. When Charles Albert of Sardinia offered Switzerland an offensive and defensive alliance in April 1848, James Fazy (1794–1878) of Geneva, H. Druey (1799–1855) of Vaud and Stämpfli of Berne favoured it.

'Warnung' (1843) warned the Swiss who had freed themselves from the rule of the aristocracy and were living in joy and prosperity, against enslavement by the 'black peril' (*ibid.*, p. 77). Conservatives like Burckhardt, who protested against the Free Corps as 'loathsome,' nevertheless shared the radical dislike of clericalism. Burckhardt wrote at that time to Kinkel: 'It is to me as fully evident that the great era of Christianity belongs to the past as that twice two makes four; history will show in its own time how Christianity's eternal values can be saved in new forms. But I feel only pity for the present attempts at religious restoration and I despise them if they appeal to the power of the state.' See also Thomas Velin, 'Politische Poesie zur Sonderbundzeit,' *Schweizer Rundschau*, XLVII (July/August 1947), pp. 334–352.

[1] Edgar Bonjour, *Geschichte der Schweiz*, *op. cit.*, vol. II, p. 482, stressed that in that period political affinity (*politische Glaubensverwandtschaft*) was much stronger than national character (*nationale Eigenart*). See on the period P. Feddersen, *Geschichte der schweizerischen Regeneration von 1830 bis 1848* (Zürich: Verlags-Magazin, 1867), and Ernst Gagliardi, *Geschichte der Schweiz von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, 3 vols., vol. III (Zürich: Orell Füssli, 1937).

— 13 —

GOTTFRIED KELLER: GERMAN-SWISS NATIONALITY

THE relationship of the Swiss to their co-linguists beyond their borders was, in the middle of the nineteenth century, in no way as clearly defined as it was one hundred years later. Many German-speaking Swiss felt a dual loyalty: the Swiss canton was their political fatherland, the still ill-defined Germany was their cultural homeland.[1] In 1844 Keller called Germany 'mein zweites Heimatland' (my second home) and regarded the Rhine not as a boundary but as a connecting link on the shores of which he could be at the same time a Swiss and a German.[2] A lively discussion was started by an article 'Deutschland und die Schweiz,' reprinted from Cotta's *Deutsche Vierteljahresschrift* in the Augsburger

[1] The still unsettled conditions of nationalism in that period are shown by men like Ernst Hermann Joseph Münch (1798–1841) who was born in the Aargau and taught history there. In 1816 he participated as a student in the founding of the Burschenschaft at the University in Freiburg i.B. He returned there in 1824, to teach history, then left to become professor in Liége, where, however, he was received with hostility, partly as an opponent of Catholicism and partly as an opponent of the Belgian liberal movement for separation from Holland. After 1831 he was librarian in Württemberg. He maintained that the political community of German and French Switzerland was the result of eighteenth-century cosmopolitanism and therefore without secure foundation. In his *Erinnerungen, Lebensbilder und Studien*, 2 vols. (Karlsruhe, 1836–1837), vol. I, pp. 431–435, he wrote that his heart and mind were always attracted to Germany and that Switzerland should enter the union of the German family (*germanische Familienbund.*)

[2] In the poems 'Am Vorderrhein' and 'Einkehr unterhalb des Rheinfalls,' *Sämtliche Werke*, *op. cit.*, vol. XIV, pp. 244, 245:

> Wohl mir, dass ich dich endlich fand,
> Du stiller Ort am alten Rhein,
> Wo ungestört und ungeharmt
> Ich Schweizer darf und Deutscher sein!

At the same time he praised Switzerland as the repository of liberty for all the Germans, who had none.

Allgemeine Zeitung of January 14–17, 1841. The anonymous author claimed German Switzerland as a part of the German Reich; he was convinced that the lack of ethnic unity would doom Switzerland in the forthcoming great European struggles. For these struggles centred, he believed, around the true nature of nationality. Swiss nationality was, according to the German author, without any real foundation, a mere invention by Johannes Müller and Friedrich von Schiller. Swiss writers protested against this neglect of imponderable factors, but some, like Johann Karl von Tscharner, later editor of the newspaper *Der Bund* in Berne, though they rejected a political tie, accepted a cultural community of Germany and Switzerland. But Keller, in one of his earliest poems, rejected the attempts to determine a nation by its racial or ethnic component parts. Such a theory, which was then propagated from Germany, he maintained would reduce all nationalities to a primitive tribal stage. Like English and French thinkers, and in sharp contrast to German theories of nationalism, Keller believed that a nation was based upon a common idea and not upon biological and prehistorical factors.

> Wenn jedes Volk nach seinen Elementen,
> Aus denen in der Urzeit es entstand,
> Sich eines Tages wieder scheiden müsste:
> Fürwahr! ich kaum ein Erdenvölklein wüsste,
> Das nicht zerstöbe wie der Wüste Sand,
> Wie Schaum vom Meer, den wilde Stürme trennten.

In his 'Vermischte Gedanken über die Schweiz' (1841) Keller pointed to England which, like Switzerland, was composed of various racial and ethnic groups—Britons, Romans, Saxons, Normans, and Celts—yet like Switzerland formed a distinct nationality of its own kind, whole and indivisible. He could have referred as well to the United States.[1]

[1] The poem is one of the 'Schweizerische Sonette,' *Sämtliche Werke, op. cit.*, vol. XIII, p. 161. In 1841 he wrote (*ibid.*, vol. XXI, p. 101 f) 'Die Deutschen glauben uns dadurch hauptsächlich zum Schweigen zu bringen, dass sie behaupten, das schweizerische Volk gehöre seiner Abstammung nach gar nicht zusammen, sondern die deutsche Schweiz gehöre eigentlich zu Deutschland, die französische

Many of the German refugees in Switzerland propagated a German nationalism to include the Swiss. Practically all of them were radicals who had fought in Germany against the established historical order and for a democratic united nation. Some of them, like the brothers Snell, Ludwig (1785–1854), and Wilhelm (1789–1851), exercised a great influence on Swiss radicalism. Julius Fröbel (1805–1895)—a nephew of the famous educator Friedrich Fröbel (1782–1852), who had fought as one of the volunteers against Napoleon in Lützow's free corps—lived after 1833 as a teacher in Zürich. In 1840 he founded there the publishing house 'Das Literarische Comptoir' which existed until 1846 and printed the writings of German political refugees.[1] He was also active as

zu Frankreich . . . das ist vorsätzliche Nichtbeachtung unseres Nationalcharakters. . . . Die jetzige Bevölkerung Englands ist entstanden aus Britaniern, Römern, Angelsachsen, Normannen, Kelten usf., die alle einander wechselweise besiegt, verdrängt und unterdrückt haben, und doch ist die englische Nation jetzt eine ganze, unteilbare, originell in ihrem Charakter und weder mit den jetzigen Franzosen noch Deutschen noch irgend einem Volke ähnlich. So ists auch mit den Schweizern gegangen.'

[1] Fröbel left Switzerland in 1846, represented the *Grossdeutsch* federalists and democratic party in Frankfurt in 1848, participated in the Baden uprising in the following year and lived then for eight years in the United States. After 1866 he adhered, like so many former German democrats, to Prussia and served the Bismarckian Reich. His last five years he spent in retirement in Zürich, where he died. In his *Ein Lebenslauf. Aufzeichnungen, Erinnerungen und Bekenntnisse*, vol. I (Stuttgart: Cotta, 1890), he wrote that of all the periods of his life he remembered least that in Switzerland. He was now critical of the role which the Swiss and German radicals had played at that time. He wrote of Zürich (p. 72), 'Vom Schullehrerseminare bis zur Hochschule wurden die Lehrerstellen von Deutschen besetzt. . . . Es war eine geistige Revolution, welche von der zur Herrschaft gelangten radikalen Partei beabsichtigt war und mit fremden Kräften durchgeführt wurde, ein Bruch mit der Kulturgeschichte des Landes, zu welchem es nicht an Gründen fehlte, gegen den sich aber auch mit Grund viel einwenden liess, und welcher daher seinen natürlichen Rückschlag gehabt hat.'

Though Fröbel published Rohmer's work, he opposed its tendency and wrote a pamphlet 'Friedrich Rohmer aus Weissenburg in Franken und seine messianischen Geschäfte in Zürich, ein Wort in eigener Sache und ein Beitrag zur Geschichte reaktionärer Spekulationen unserer Tage.'

See about Fröbel, Ernst Feuz, *J. F., seine politische Entwicklung bis 1849* (Berne: P. Haupt, 1932); Clara Börner, *J. F. und das österreichische Bundesreformprojekt aus dem Jahre 1863* (thesis Marburg, 1919); Hans Lülfing, *Die Entwicklung von J. F. politischen Anschauungen in den Jahren 1863–1871*, mit besonderer Berücksichtigung seiner Stellung zur deutschen Frage (thesis Leipzig, 1931).

an editor of periodicals; in 1842 he added the *Schweizerischer Republikaner* to his *Deutscher Bote aus der Schweiz*. There he made it clear that he did not regard the Swiss as a nation, for they did not form a racial or linguistic community: 'Im deutschen Sprachgebrauch versteht man unter Nationalität so viel als Volks- oder Stammesgemeinschaft, ein Band, welches im Bewusstsein der Blutverwandtschaft oder gemeinsamen Abstammung besteht und einerseits die Gemeinsamkeit des Temperamentes oder der ganzen physisch-psychologischen Organisation, andererseits die Gemeinsamkeit der Sprache und Literatur und somit des eigentümlichen Stils der höheren geistigen Bildung zur notwendigen Folge hat. Dass die Schweizer sich in diesem Sinne des Wortes keine Nationalität beilegen können, ist für jeden klar, welcher auch nur im Besitze einiger Anfangsgründe der Geschichte ist' (In the German language, nationality means a folk or tribal community, a tie consisting in the consciousness of common blood or descent. From it follows necessarily the kinship of the whole physiological and psychological structure and the community of language and literature and thereby of all intellectual life. Everybody who has even a most rudimentary knowledge of history, will immediately understand that the Swiss cannot claim nationality in this sense of the word).

Fröbel defined well the prevailing German concept of nationality, though with typical arrogance he was unaware of the fact that there could be other concepts of nationality and nationalism and other understandings of history. Keller saw clearly the difference between the two kinds of nationalism. In his patriotic sonnet 'Die schweizerische Nationalität' (1844) he accepted the importance of language:

> Die Sprache ist das teure Jugendland,
> Darin die Völker wachsen und gedeihen,
> Das Mutterhaus, wonach sie sehnend schreien,
> Wenn sie verschüttet sind auf fremden Sand!

Yet he knew that the emphasis on language could become a fetter and that the desire for the political freedom of the individual had

greater claim upon man's loyalty than the ties of blood or language:

> Denn Einen Pred'ger nur verträgt der Dom!
> Das ist die Freiheit, der politische Glaube!
> Der erlöst und sprengt die eingewachsne Kette.[1]

In one of his first essays, which he wrote at the age of twenty-two, Keller expressed well the character of Swiss nationalism: 'Swiss national character does not rest on ancestors nor on patriotic sagas of the country's past nor on anything material; it rests on the Swiss people's love of freedom, on their unique attachment to their small but beautiful and dear fatherland, on the home-sickness which seizes them even in the loveliest foreign lands. When an alien loves the Swiss constitution, when he feels happier among us than in a monarchical State, when he gladly accepts our habits and customs and assimilates himself, then he is as good a Swiss as someone whose fathers fought at Sempach. On the other hand, if a Swiss sympathizes too much with France or Germany, if he feels at ease as a subject of a foreign sovereign, if he gladly accepts foreign habits and despises those of his native land, he is no longer a Swiss, he is a Frenchman or an Austrian, where his heart draws him, and that should not be held against him; for the inclinations and desires of man are as manifold as the stars in the sky. . . . The Swiss has found out that his soul requires the independence of the whole fatherland, the freedom of thought and expression, the complete equality of rights and the non-recognition of class and caste. The Swiss likes to speak of his liberty, but he does not try to force it upon anybody else, and why shouldn't he talk of it lovingly? Every good subject likes to talk of his king, and our king is liberty; we have none other.[2]

[1] *Sämtliche Werke, op. cit.*, vol. XIV, pp. 75, 332. In another sonnet (p. 76) Keller compared a nationality newly formed out of politically like-minded people (wo Gleichgesinnte eine Heimat fanden) in its hard strength and firm unity to a diamond. See also Hans Max Kriesi, *Gottfried Keller als Politiker* (Frauenfeld: Huber, 1918); Jonas Fränkel, *Gottfried Kellers politische Sendung* (Zürich: Oprecht, 1939) and 'Gottfried Keller und das Problem der schweizerischen Nationalität,' *Nation*, Berne, July 26 and August 1, 1935.

[2] *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. XXI, pp. 103–105.

Keller's concept of Swiss nationality did not differ fundamentally from the Anglo-American concept of nationality, a community not determined primarily by biological factors but representing an idea, the idea of personal liberty, in which men of different origin could share upon the strength of a free individual decision. In spite of their similarity, the two concepts are to some degree different: the American idea is rooted preponderantly in the general climate of the Enlightenment, the Swiss idea in an historical past, yet in neither case is the predominant trend exclusive: the rational and the historical elements are present in both cases, though varying in strength. The American national idea of liberty carried from the beginning a missionary vocation and a universal message; the Swiss idea of liberty was much more self-contained, with hardly any desire of spreading its blessings. There was something wide and broad, something pan-human, not only in the American land but also in the American idea, which welcomed into its bosom millions of men from outside and assimilated them, with a strength elsewhere unequalled, into its way of life. The broad avenues of approach across the ocean led to open ports. The Swiss idea was much more bound to a narrow territory with often forbidding and closely guarded frontiers, and the idea itself had very often something of this narrowness—the exclusiveness of the *Kantönligeist* was not confined to the cantons, frequently it characterized Switzerland as a whole.

In a beautiful passage in the first version of his novel *Der Grüne Heinrich* Keller stressed the historical character of the Swiss idea, its centuries old tradition with its ability of adapting itself to changing circumstances, growing and developing, and permeating all those who accepted it with a similar mentality, similar habits and moral convictions. In the confusion of the nineteenth century, the age of nationalism, which Keller observed all around Switzerland and which he believed caused by the desire to establish nationhood on hoary concepts of race, ancestors and language, he praised the Swiss for basing their nationality on an invisible idea alive in the air of their mountains. With them it was not a community of blood or language which produced a national

idea or a national character, it was on the contrary (as in Anglo-America) an idea which created the nationality as its embodiment. 'Around an ancient nucleus a much diversified community slowly grew up, which assimilated the traditions of the nucleus, as far as they remained of vital importance and which perpetually tries to adapt them to changing circumstances. Thus similar inclinations in a beautiful country, the parts of which resemble each other, many neighbourly contacts and a common tough determination to maintain independence, have produced in Switzerland a common federal life distinguished from any other national life. This common life has influenced the character of its various members and parts and has produced a far-reaching similarity of attitudes and character. In this our common nationality we feel protected against the confusion which surrounds us on all sides. We believe we recognize the dreamy character of the nationalism around us which bases itself on hoary memories of the past, on linguistic and racial traditions. Therefore we cling to our own Swiss kind of nationalism. We can say that it is not our nationality which creates and influences our ideas, but an invisible idea existing in these mountains has created the distinct Swiss nationality as its embodiment.'[1]

[1] Gottfried Keller, *Der Grüne Heinrich*. Nach der ersten Fassung 1854–55 (Berlin: Brandussche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1919), p. 43. In the same chapter Heinrich, the young Swiss student and artist, explains on his first trip to Germany to a German the character of Swiss nationalism: 'The French Swiss swears by Corneille, . . . the Swiss from the Tessin believes only in Italian music, . . . and the German Swiss receives his education by digging deep into German culture (holt seine Bildung aus den tiefen Schächten des deutschen Volkes). All of them, however, endeavour to bring everything back and to use it only for the greater glory of their fatherland, . . . and the more the Swiss are different by descent and language, the more they are attracted to each other, held together in friendship by a history of common struggles and by the insight which they have acquired that they are happiest together living under their institutions.'

— 14 —

THE FEDERAL PRINCIPLE AND NATIONAL UNITY

KELLER knew that the Swiss idea drew its vigour from the diversity of its constituent elements. Without her cantons, living each one its own life, he wrote, Switzerland would be only an empty barrel. Competing with each other in their self-development, the cantons helped to preserve the very idea and the fertile diversity of Switzerland. In conformity with the unitarian nationalism then propagated in Italy and Germany, some Swiss Radicals in the 1840's demanded a strictly unified nation. In a story dealing with the elections to the Great Council of the canton Zürich, Keller showed a better understanding of Swiss nationhood: 'What do you want with your Switzerland without her old and new cantons? It would be only an empty barrel. . . . The red uniform of Helvetia with the white cross is beautiful, but equally beautiful are the twenty-two white shirts beneath the uniform, each one different with its own coat of arms. Without the federal tie no Swiss citizens would exist, but without cantons and without their differences and competition, no Swiss federation would exist: this is the cornerstone in our fatherland. We wish that our canton play a leading role in this competition; this depends on the Great Council which we have to elect today. It should be a beacon for the fulfilment of our duties to the federation and to the canton alike, to preserve the fertile diversity of our Swiss land.'[1]

In the middle of the nineteenth century the European continent was groping to find a federative solution for the relationship of groups within the individual states and of the states within Europe as a whole. It failed lamentably in Germany and Austria,

[1] *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. XX, p. 61. From the story *Der Wahltag* (pp. 49–68).

in Italy and Russia. 'Federative polity is a polity,' an American historian discussing that period wrote, 'that emphasizes the political relation of adjustment among equals rather than the political relationships of inferiority and superiority, and methods of law rather than methods of force. . . . For Europe as a whole, federative polity declined [after the middle of the nineteenth century] almost to the point of extinction in this era, but survived among Anglo-Saxon peoples, in the United States of America, the British Empire, and in the relation of Britain to the United States.'[1] The unhappy lot of central, eastern and southern Europe in the twentieth century, the many wars from 1859 to 1914, and the bitter nationalist struggles within the various states resulted from the rejection of federalism by the nationalist leaders of nineteenth-century Europe. There was, however, one exception: Switzerland. There, as among the English-speaking peoples, an adjustment of political relations among equals was achieved, in spite of deep linguistic, religious, and ideological differences, predominantly through methods of law. The spirit of compromise and tolerance, a mixture of sober respect for law and tradition and of daring pragmatic response to the challenge of new circumstances—a temper very similar to the one prevailing among the English and North Americans—made this unique success on the European continent possible.

Appealing to this spirit of tolerance and open-mindedness, Gottfried Keller was convinced that Switzerland would weather the storm of the period, 'through accepting and welcoming every good thought from wherever it originates, through appreciating the element of truth presented by all parties, and through nurturing the spirit of reconciliation in our hearts even in the midst of the bitterest struggle.'[2] Representing this spirit himself, Keller changed in the 1840's from a violent radical to a man with a balanced judgment, willing to seek patiently for enduring solutions. On July 20, 1847, he noted in his diary: 'I feel the highest respect for the men in our government. I owe a great gratitude to these men.

[1] Robert C. Binkley, *Realism and Nationalism 1852–1871* (New York: Harper, 1935), p. XIX.

[2] *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. XXI, p. 108.

Through their example I have changed from a vague revolutionary and an adherent of the free corps *à tout prix* into a considerate and sensible man who honours the blessings of beautiful and solid forms also in political life and who wishes to combine charity with energy, the greatest possible benevolence and patience with courage and resolution. At a time, however, when the living forces break through almost everywhere, especially in our country, where justice triumphs legally to an ever-growing degree, revolution becomes daily more and more inadmissible and superfluous. Soon we shall have to condemn all revolution, for in a period when the constitutional principles of liberty will be established, the revolution will become the heir of absolutism.'[1] In this spirit Switzerland overcame the civil war of 1847 and outgrew its bitterness into the reconciliation of a nation, free in diversity and yet solidly united, a nation which recognized that not strong rule and uniformity, but balances and compromises are the cement which keeps political communities together in a dynamic society.

[1] *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. XXI, p. 81 f. As early as May 1, 1848, Keller saw the threat which German nationalism presented in that year to German liberty. He wrote in his diary (p. 95 f): 'Am meisten aber quält mich das ewige Kriegsgeschrei gegen Frankreich. Kaum war der erste Freudenschrei, der über den Rhein kam, verhallt, kaum war die ungeheure Lavine, welche er in Deutschland erweckte, im Schuss, so hiess es zum Danke wie aus einem Munde: Rüstet euch gegen den Erbfeind! Als Antwort darauf erschien das Manifest Lamartines; es wurde verhöhnt; nach abgemessenen Pausen ertönt der monotone widerliche Ruf dort: Sie kommen, sie kommen heut, sie kommen morgen, oder gewiss übermorgen—und drüben rührt sich keine Seele.'

— 15 —

THE SWISS CIVIL WAR II

ARTICLE 6 of the Federal Pact of 1815 allowed the cantons to form alliances if they were not prejudicial to the Confederation or to the rights of the other cantons. The period of political excitement after 1830 produced several ideological alliances among cantons. In 1832 the seven leading 'regenerated' cantons (Zürich, Berne, Lucerne, Solothurn, St. Gallen, Aargau and Thurgau) united to protect their democratic institutions against any intervention by the Confederation or by the Great Powers. The conservative cantons (Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Valais, Neuchâtel, and Basle-City) countered in the so-called *Sarnerbund*. Political shifts soon undid these formations. In 1845, when the Confederation decided not to enforce article 12 of the Federal Pact—which guaranteed the maintenance of religious orders in the cantons—against the canton Aargau, the Catholic cantons sought to establish a more permanent ideological pact, which they called *Schutzvereinigung*, protective alliance, but which is better known in history as *Sonderbund* or separatist confederation. 'In conformity with the Federal Pact of August 7, 1815, and with ancient alliances,' seven cantons (Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, Lucerne, Zug, Fribourg and Valais) met in Lucerne on December 10, 1845, and pledged mutual support in case of attack upon their territory. A council of war was formed to convene should such an attack threaten or actually happen. This step exacerbated the conflict. The radicals saw in the Sonderbund an outpost of the Holy Alliance and of Roman plans for world conquest, a plot against the unity of the nation, the defeat of which would be a victory for the unity of the fatherland and the liberty of mankind. Jakob Amiet (1817–1883) of Solothurn called upon the Swiss 'to war against alien, un-Swiss, thoroughly anti-national

elements.' Karl Neuhaus (1796–1849) of Berne declared that the salvation of national survival took precedence over the Pact. 'I don't care for the Federal Pact; it is a scrap of paper! Salus publica suprema lex esto. I wish to save Switzerland.' As President of the Diet he asked: 'A Federal Pact, is it everything? I do not hesitate to answer this question negatively.'[1]

The leaders of the *Sonderbund* rejected this very premise of the precedence of the dynamic force of the new nationalism over constituted laws and liberties. In 1847 Switzerland was not yet a nation. The Federal Pact of 1815 established merely an alliance of sovereign cantons. Had they the right to withdraw from the Pact in case of its violation and when the majority, perhaps a very tenuous majority, sanctioned this violation and thereby destroyed the Pact? A prominent leader of the *Sonderbund*, Philip Anton von Segesser (1817–1888), the historian of his native Republic of Lucerne and for forty years its representative in the Swiss National Council, wrote on February 9, 1848, to his friend Andreas Häusler-Ryhiner (1802–1868), a conservative politician and professor of law in Basle: 'Switzerland interests me only because the canton of Lucerne, which is my fatherland, lies there. Should the canton of Lucerne no longer exist as a free and sovereign member of the Confederation, then the latter is to me of as little importance as the Great or Little Tartary [so gleichgiltig als die Grosse oder Kleine Tartarei].'[2] In a short analysis of the

[1] See Edgar Bonjour, 'Die Sonderbundswirren und das Ausland,' *Neue Schweizer Rundschau*, Dec. 1947, p. 480. A source book for the understanding of the conflict is Edgar Bonjour, *Das Schicksal des Sonderbundes in zeitgenössischer Darstellung* (Aarau: Sauerländer, 1947). See also Fritz Rieter, *Der Sonderbundskrieg* (Zürich: Schulthess, 1948); Olivier Reverdin, *La guerre du Sonderbund vue par le General Dufour, Juin 1847–Avril 1848* (Geneva: Journal de Genève, 1948); Werner Näf, *Die Schweiz in der deutschen Revolution 1847–1849* (Frauenfeld: Huber, 1929); Eduard Vischer, 'Der Aargau und die Sonderbundskrise,' *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Geschichte*, XXVIII (1948) pp. 1–46.

[2] The *Briefwechsel* 1842–1867 between Segesser and Häusler was published by Eduard Hiss (Basler Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Altertumskunde, vol. 31, Basle, 1932). See also the selections from Segesser's political writings, *Politik der Schweiz, ihre Ideen und Grundlagen*, ed. by Oscar Alig (Lucerne: Vita Nova Verlag, 1937) and his *Fünfundvierzig Jahre im Luzernischen Staatsdienst, Erinnerungen und*

events, written in November 1847, Segesser was objective enough to acknowledge that the formation of the *Sonderbund* was a political mistake, because it isolated the seven cantons from their conservative friends elsewhere and afforded its enemies the long-desired quasi-legal pretext for the destruction of the five-centuries-old liberty of the oldest peoples of the Confederation ('zur Vernichtung der fünfhundertjährigen Freiheit der ältesten Völker der Eidgenossenschaft'). The people of the founding cantons which had established the Swiss confederation in the thirteenth century, saw in the *Sonderbund* the renewal of the ancient Confederation for faithful mutual assistance, this time against the arrogance of younger, larger and more populous cantons, which threatened their liberties and the existence of the Catholic faith and its institutions. Segesser described the 'general deep enthusiasm, based upon religious motives,' which at the approach of the civil war was felt throughout the Sonderbund, 'in all classes and age-groups and which penetrated to the most remote huts. All private disputes were forgotten; thousands made pilgrimages to the tombs of the Saints, thousands received daily the last sacrament of the Catholic Church. One heart, One soul, One sentiment united the rich and the poor, the upper and the lower classes, old men and the youth, as in the times of the Crusades, into one determination to dare and to suffer everthing for the political and religious liberty of the country.'

Another leader of the *Sonderbund*, Franz von Elgger (1794–1858), looking back on the lost cause wrote: 'I fought and suffered not as a standard bearer of a party but as a citizen of Lucerne, for our good and courageous people, and as a Swiss for the ancient Confederation, for the heritage of our fathers, for true liberty, for the independence of our fatherland. For this sublime goal I have sacrificed more than my life, the future of my children and the blood of my son. Fate has condemned me to survive the day of shame, yet I stand upright with a clear conscience and I throw

Akten aus dem kantonalen Leben 1841–1887 (Berne, 1887). On Segesser see Werner Ganz, 'Philip Anton von Segesser als Politiker,' *Schweizerische Zeitschrift fur Geschichte*, I (1951) pp. 245–274.

my broken sword on the coffin of the old Switzerland.'[1] The *Sonderbund* regarded its fight as a war for faith and fatherland, for religious and political liberty. The radicals in the other camp appeared as uprooted cosmopolitans and as representatives of the anti-Christ. Constantin Siegwart-Müller saw the struggle as one between *Recht und Gewalt*, right and force. 'Centralization everywhere,' he wrote, 'kills the people's liberty [die Zentralisation ist überall die Mörderin der Volksfreiheit]; the independence of the State from the Church and of the Church from the State leads to the decay of Christianity, which has the world mission to permeate and to sustain all social relationships.'

The radicals in the Diet pressed for the revision of the Pact, the dissolution of the *Sonderbund* and the expulsion of the Jesuits. For a long time they could not find a majority of cantons to support them. The moderates among the Protestants sympathized with the *Sonderbund*. Only after the radicals had gained control in Geneva and in St. Gallen, the Diet, on July 22, 1847, decided, by the barest majority of twelve votes out of twenty-two, to dissolve the *Sonderbund*. 'Douze voix font Loi,' but the *Sonderbund* delegates, led by Bernhard Meyer (1810–1874) of Lucerne, refused to bow to the decision of the majority and left the Diet on October 29th. Six days later the Diet decided to impose its will by the force of arms. Nevertheless, the triumphant Radicals did not determine the outcome. Foreshadowing the spirit of compromise which was to settle the civil war, the Diet appointed a moderate, Guillaume-Henri Dufour (1787–1875) from Geneva, as commander-in-chief. The Catholic cantons were quickly defeated in spite of the religious enthusiasm, their pride in their past history and in their fierce struggles for independence, and in

[1] Elgger, *Des Kantons Luzern und seiner Bundesgenossen Kampf gegen den Radikalismus vom 8. Dezember 1844 bis 24. November 1847 und mein Anteil an demselben* (Schaffhausen, 1850) p. 437. Elgger was not a native citizen of Lucerne. He was a professional officer, who had served abroad for many years and then became a colonel in the Swiss army and director of its general staff school. Having been naturalized in Lucerne, he put himself at the service of the canton and became chief of staff of the army of the inner Swiss cantons. After the defeat he accepted service in the Papal army.

spite of the determination expressed in their anthem, written by Joseph Balthasar Ulrich (1817–1875), 'Den Riesenkampf mit dieser Zeit zu wagen. . . .' (to dare the giant struggle with these times). They were so poorly led, militarily and politically, that the *Sonderbund* collapsed within three weeks. The casualties on both sides were insignificant: they amounted to 128 men dead and 435 wounded, the majority of them on the victorious side.

It was an unequal struggle from the very beginning. The general of the *Sonderbund*, Johann Ulrich von Salis-Soglio, found no real support in the political leadership; the *Sonderbund* cantons formed no continuing territory and could thus be easily defeated one by one; they were much inferior in numbers, equipment, and economic resources; and they did not receive the aid from abroad for which they had hoped. France, Austria, Prussia and Russia decided to intervene, but they came too late. Their slow negotiations were not helped by Palmerston, the British Foreign Secretary, whose agent in Switzerland, Robert Peel (1822–1895), the oldest son of Sir Robert, the former Prime Minister, supported the cause of the Swiss liberals. General Dufour's quick victory was even more helpful than Britain's sympathy. Before the European powers could decide upon a common step after the defeat of the *Sonderbund*, the revolutions of 1848 had broken out in France and in Austria. The cause of the radicals had triumphed not only in Switzerland but, at least for the moment, all over Europe. The victors in the Swiss civil war were now free to lay the foundations for the new nation. Everything depended on their choice: would they follow the intoxication of a victory which in its successful challenge of the Holy Alliance set an example to the whole of Europe or would they, in a far-sighted spirit of restraint, reconcile the victors and the defeated, tradition and progress, liberty and law?

— 16 —

THE SWISS GLORIOUS REVOLUTION

THE European liberals regarded the defeat of the Swiss *Sonderbund*, in November 1847, as the opening of a new era of universal liberty. The German poet Ferdinand Freiligrath jubilantly proclaimed from London that the victorious struggle in the (Swiss) highlands against the clerical forces had opened the road to liberty there and here, for ever and all over the globe.

> Im Hochland fiel der erste Schuss,
> Im Hochland wider die Pfaffen. . . .
> Die Freiheit dort, die Freiheit hier,
> Die Freiheit jetzt und für und für,
> Die Freiheit rings auf Erden!

The two French historians who were close personal friends, Jules Michelet and Edgar Quinet, wrote on December 12, 1847, to the Swiss Diet: 'Puissiez vous . . . fonder par un grand example un nouveau droit pour l'Europe!' Friedrich Engels regarded the victory of the Protestant cantons as the triumph of industrialization, of centralization, and of the bourgeoisie, establishing thereby the conditions for the coming proletarian revolution. He treated with utmost contempt the Catholic cantons, which had been the cradle of Switzerland and of the Swiss tradition of liberty. He called them 'the centre of barbarism and the nursery of the Jesuits.' He was convinced that their ancient and famous victories of Sempach and Murten were not 'manifestations of liberty but desperate acts of brutal and bigoted mountaineers who resisted civilization and progress.' Could the cradle of liberty really be found among the descendants of Tell and Winkelried? Engels disagreed with Friedrich Schiller and the older liberals; he had no doubt that Tell and Winkelried were 'reactionaries.'[1]

[1] The two articles 'Der Schweizer Bürgerkrieg' and 'Die Bewegungen von 1847' appeared in the *Deutsche Brüssler Zeitung*, November 14, 1847, and January

The Swiss themselves were more modest in their appraisal of the importance of the Swiss civil war and of its world-historical implications. Soberly they concentrated upon the immediate task at hand: as fast as possible to forget the civil war and the decade of excitement and bitterness which preceded it. For a few days the victorious Protestants committed acts of barbarism in the monasteries and churches of Fribourg. Some Protestants regarded the skirmish at Gislikon, where the army of General Dufour forced its way across the Reuss River into Lucerne, as the revenge for the battle of Kappel, where more than three centuries ago, in 1531, the Catholic cantons defeated Zürich and where the Swiss reformer Ulrich Zwingli fell. But the spirit of resentment and of refighting ancient battles and quarrels quickly disappeared. Once the brief war was fought and decided, all efforts were concentrated on healing the wounds, on rebuilding unity, and on reconciling the various viewpoints, not on exacerbating them by historical reminiscences. National romanticism, musing about past wrongs, and expectations of future growth at the expense of the adversary, were not allowed to interfere with the practical task at hand.[1] Though the nationalists on the European continent treated the Swiss civil war as the dawn of the new age, they never learned the lesson implied in its settlement. For that reason they

23, 1848; *Marx-Engels' Gesamtausgabe*, ed. by Marx-Engels-Lenin Institute in Moscow, section I, vol. VI, pp. 342 ff. See Wilfred Haeberli, 'Friedrich Engels und der Sonderbund,' *Zeitschrift fur schweizerische Geschichte*, XXVII (1947), pp. 534–541.

[1] One of the few examples of Swiss romantic nationalism was the periodical *Pfeil des Tellen. Eine schweizerische Monatsschrift fur Volk, Wissenschaft und Politik, zum besseren Verständnis der Schweiz*, published by Peter Konradin von Planta (1815–1902). The periodical appeared in Zürich in 1841 for nine months. In another short-lived periodical, *Neue Helvetia*, which also appeared in Zürich, Planta complained that Switzerland rewarded its best sharpshooters, but not its poets or artists. In 1848 he published in Chur under the pen-name Pertinax Philalathea *Die Wissenschaft des Staates oder die Lehre von dem Lebensorganismus*, a book dealing with man and the cosmos and revealing the influence of Schelling and Oken. A second part dealing with Society and the State appeared in 1852. See Leo Weisz, 'Die Anfänge der organischen Staatsauffassung in der Schweiz,' *Neue Schweizer Rundschau*, October 1933, pp. 342–356.

lost, in the revolutions of 1848, the cause of liberty in the welter of nationalist and ideological passions.

In Switzerland, on the other hand, General Dufour himself conducted the war as humanely as possible and tried to remove by its conduct all causes for future bitterness. In his proclamation he stressed the fact that Catholic soldiers from Solothurn, Tessin and St. Gallen were fighting in his army, while the general commanding the *Sonderbund* forces was a Protestant. Switzerland knew no period of 'reconstruction' comparable to that which followed the civil war in the United States. In the commission which met on February 16, 1848, less than three months after the end of the civil war, to draft a new Swiss constitution, the defeated cantons were fully and equally represented. The chairman of the commission, Ulrich Ochsenbein, the famous leader of the Berne radicals, stressed the need for mutual concessions. The outbreak of the French Revolution in February, which set most of Europe afire, found Switzerland as peaceful as England, where foreign observers had expected the Chartist masses to start the social revolution. Only in the canton Neuchâtel which, as a member of the Swiss Confederation, was at the same time a principality ruled by the King of Prussia, an anomalous situation in the middle of the nineteenth century, the democrats from the industrial centre of La Chaux de Fonds under the leadership of the watchmaker Fritz Courvoisier (1799–1854) captured, on February 29th, the city of Neuchâtel and instituted there a republican regime under the local lawyer Alexis Marie Piaget. Two months later a plebiscite in the canton accepted the republican constitution by 5,800 votes against 4,400, but the King refused to abdicate and the question was not settled until eight years later.

— 17 —

THE SETTLEMENT OF 1848

WHEREAS the German parliament in Frankfurt a.M. in 1848 spent many months in discussing the constitution and wasted much time on theoretical debates, the Swiss acted in a quick and businesslike way. In the German parliament professors and journalists, unexperienced in executive and administrative positions, predominated: in the Swiss assembly practical politicians took the lead, who had been active themselves as administrators and legislators for many years in their own cantons. Naturally, the solution found for Switzerland did not satisfy everybody: the radicals did not like the spirit of compromise and historical traditionalism in which the new constitution was drawn up and the extreme conservatives mourned every infringement of the traditional full sovereignty of the cantons. But the old Confederation could not continue at a time when, in Switzerland as elsewhere, modern means of communication overcame old feelings of isolation and brought the various parts of the nascent nation into close contact. In 1848 the first railroad in Switzerland was already in existence, connecting Zürich with nearby Baden, and though this innovation met much resistance and had to contend with many misgivings, it crossed mountains, opened up inaccessible valleys, and spelt the doom of tiny, independent states, many of which had only a few thousand inhabitants and covered areas of one hundred or fewer square miles; each of these cantons protected its independence by barriers of its own customs, weights, measures and monetary systems, and treated the citizens of the neighbouring cantons as aliens.[1] On the other hand, the national

[1] The *Bürklikalender* for 1848 in Zürich printed a poem called 'Lob der Eisenbahn' which ended.

Ihr eh'rne Bahnen, lehret ahnen,
Was uns die Zukunft möge sein!
O führet uns als Ehrenbahnen
Zu tiefst ins Völkerherz hinein!

unity which the radicals demanded would have aroused so much resentment and would have run so much counter to the traditional Swiss liberties, that a compromise was found, which, similarly to English custom, avoided all revolutionary appearances and preserved the historical continuity, while introducing fundamental and necessary changes.[1]

The foundations of the new nation were worked out by moderates like Jonas Furrer (1805–1861) who became the first president of the Confederation, and Johann Jacob Rüttimann (1813–1876), who had an intimate knowledge of English and American civil and public law and was the author of important works on the federal system of the United States and on the relationship of Church and State there. Characteristic was Furrer's utterance, 'The authorities recognize neither friends nor opponents but only fellow-citizens and confederates' (Die Behörde sieht weder Freunde noch Gegner vor sich, sondern nur Mitbürger und Eidgenossen). Though Furrer had taken active part in the struggle for the regeneration of his native canton Zürich, he had viewed the civil war against the *Sonderbund* with misgivings. He rejected the principle according to which it is permissible to use violence or

O führt bis in die fernsten Glieder
Des Herzens warme Schläge hin!
Bringt allen süsse Freiheit wieder
Und ew'gen Frieden zum Gewinn!

These hopes that the new railroad might promote international friendship and peace were not realized: the railroads strengthened the new nations and served as new means for military strategy in wars.

[1] 'Bien différents en cela des constituants américains et français de la fin du XVIII[e] siècle, les humbles architectes de la loi fédérale de 1848 furent loin de proclamer avec éclat l'originalité révolutionnaire de leur oeuvre. Ils cherchèrent au contraire a la dissimuler derrière le rideau d'un vocabulaire traditional. Le caractère helvetique et le bilinguisme des redacteurs suffiraient peut-être a l'expliquer. Mais il s'ajoutait encore à leur goût naturel de la sobriété, le desir de ne pas inquiéter et irriter inutilement, par les vivacités emphatiques, l'esprit positif du Suisse moyen. Il s'agissait aussi de ne pas exasperer l'hostilité des conservateurs en peignant en couleurs trop voyantes la façade de l'edifice où ils repugnaient à pénétrer. Il fallait, au contraire, desarmer leurs preventions en masquant les innovations introduites sous de rassurantes apparences verbales.' Rappard, *La Constitution fédérale de la Suisse*, *op. cit.*, p. 133.

doubtful means for the achievement of nationalist goals, be it even against foreign powers.[1] Through the efforts of these moderates, the Constitution of 1848, without arousing any bitter conflicts, created for the first time a Swiss nation and transformed its territory into an economic unit.

A Swiss nation had existed for a very short time during the Helvetic period, but then it had been a national unity imposed from outside. The nation of the Helvetic period had not been built upon the concord of which Pestalozzi wrote; it was constructed without due regard for Swiss reality in conformity with abstract logic. Therefore it did not endure. The first session of the new Swiss National Council was opened by Georg Josef Sidler (1782–1861), who was its oldest member, on November 6, 1848. Sidler, who in 1810 had protested against Napoleon's annexation of the Valais and his military occupation of the Tessin, stressed in his opening speech that this time Switzerland was united not by force or imposition, but by the will of the sovereign people. The new unification had sunk its roots deep into the Swiss soil. All the twenty-two cantons had participated in the popular vote which accepted the new constitution. Though six and a half cantons rejected it, it was adopted by more than a two-thirds majority of voters and cantons. On September 12, 1848, the Constitution entered into force; the next day the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung* wrote: 'The heart beats higher. Finally the Swiss nation has spoken and has received the right to vote which is its due. The nation, which so far has lived only in the hearts of its good citizens, now stands before us as an undeniable reality, with a decisive vote, with a broad authority. No longer will the Swiss citizens of different cantons appear as members of one nation

[1] See Emanuel Dejung, Alfred Stähli und Werner Ganz, *Jonas Furer von Winterthur, erster schweizerischer Bundespräsident* (Winterthur: Gemsberg-Verlag, 1948); Anton Largiader, *J. J. Rüttimann und die Bundesrevision von 1848* (Zürich: Schulthess, 1948); Edgar Bonjour, *Die Gründung des schweizerischen Bundesstaates* (Basle: Schwabe, 1948); Arnold Jaggi, *Die Gründung unseres Bundesstaates* (Berne: Haupt, 1948), Eduard Vischer, 'Werden und Wesen der schweizerischen Bundesverfassung von 1848.' *Geschichte in Wissenschaft und Unterricht*, February 1952, pp. 79–97.

only when they live or travel abroad; they will be Swiss and only Swiss also at home, especially in our relationships to foreign lands. Wherever we now go in Switzerland, we are at home, we are no longer aliens.'

The preamble to the Constitution used for the first time, though only after some hesitation, the word 'Swiss nation,' but it upheld the historical continuity by declaring in article 1 that 'The peoples of the twenty-two sovereign cantons of Switzerland form together the Swiss Confederation.' The aim of the Constitution was 'to affirm the alliance of the Confederates,' a statement which appealed to a more than five-hundred-years-old tradition. No lesser man than Segesser testified to the moderation and wisdom of the men who were responsible for the Swiss Constitution: 'The men of 1847 were true statesmen. They exercised the right of the victor, but they exercised it as statesmen. I have sometimes opposed them in the Council, but I always recognized that they acted as statesmen and that thereby they cultivated peace and freedom, not despotism and oppression.'[1]

[1] Segesser, *Sammlung kleiner Schriften*, 3 vols. (Berne: K. J. Wyss, 1877–1879), vol. III, p. 307.

— 18 —

THE MODEL OF THE UNITED STATES

THE new Constitution established *one* Swiss citizenship, *one* Swiss foreign policy, *one* customs union, *one* national economy, and the same political and civil liberties for all Swiss who had now the right to settle in any canton. The constitution of the United States served as a model for the solution of the problem how best to accommodate the needs of national unity with the survival of the sovereignty, traditions and rights of the individual cantons. As far back as 1833 Ignaz Paul Vital Troxler (1780–1876) had drawn the attention of his fellow-Swiss to the Constitution of the United States. 'The Constitution of the United States of America,' he wrote, 'is a great work of art which the human mind created according to the eternal laws of its divine nature. It is a model and a pattern for the organization of the public life of republics in general, in which the whole and the parts shall both be free and equal. In the year 1787 the Convention at Philadelphia solved the great problem of the conciliation of national unity with the autonomy of constituent states and this autonomy with the freedom of all citizens. The New World has solved the problem for all peoples, states and countries.[1]'

Among the Swiss statesmen James Fazy was the first who suggested the American Federal Constitution as a model. It is astonishing how quickly and deeply the 'American system' took root in Swiss soil. For Switzerland had never known institutions

[1] Troxler, *Die eine und wahre Eidgenossenschaft im Gegensatz zur Zentralherrschaft und Kantonstümelei, sowie zum neuen Zwitterbunde beider, nebst einem Verfassungsentwurf* (Rapperswill, 1833), p. 28. See William E. Rappard, 'Pennsylvania and Switzerland: the American origins of the Swiss Constitution,' *Studies in Political Science and Sociology* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1941) pp. 49–123. Troxler wrote also *Die Verfassung der Vereinigten Staaten Nordamerikas als Musterbild der schweizerischen Bundesreform* (Schaffhausen, 1848).

like those introduced in 1848. 'Neither in its federalism nor in its bi-cameral institutions had the new Constitution a precedent in the previous history of the country.'[1] The Swiss Constitution of 1848 created, after the model of the United States, two Chambers, a *Ständerat* or Council of States, and a *Nationalrat* or National Council. The latter represented the new Swiss nation and consisted of deputies elected directly and uniformly by the people all over the nation, one deputy for each 22,000 souls. The Council of States, on the other hand, continued the tradition of the old Diet; each canton was represented by two delegates, chosen and paid by each canton according to its own constitution. Bills became law only by the approval of both Chambers. In Switzerland, where the cantons are much more sharply divided by language, religion and historical tradition than is the case among the states in North America, the Council of States has a greater importance for the preservation of national harmony than the Senate in the United States. In Switzerland the equal voting power of every canton created a privileged position for the small cantons, and especially for the cantons defeated in the civil war. In the National Council, Berne, the most populous canton and the leader among the victors, had thirty deputies; Uri, the canton with the smallest population and the one which most consistently clung to the old sovereignty defended by the *Sonderbund*, had

[1] In the conclusion of his paper (*op. cit.*) Rappard wrote: 'What is of universal interest, is the lesson of how general union can be combined with local freedom. That lesson, which the disunited nations of the world have still to learn from the United States of America, as the since united cantons of Switzerland learned it from them merely a century ago, is one of peculiarly tragic timeliness today.' Rappard quoted from J. J. Rüttimann, *Das nordamerikanische Bundesstaatsrecht verglichen mit den politischen Einrichtungen der Schweiz*, 3 vols. (Zürich: 1867, 1872, 1876), vol. I, p. IV: 'The North American Union at present unites about forty states of quite unequal size and power in a community of law. . . . Likewise in small Switzerland, which was formerly decried as the seat of constant anarchy and wild discord, the federal state has since 1848 justified itself as a foundation on which the citizens of twenty-five cantons, in spite of their diversity of speech, of faith, of political views and of material interests, have been able to live together in happy and ordered circumstances and to develop in common a gratifying prosperity.' Rüttimann expressed the hope that Europe as a whole would follow the American and Swiss example.

one deputy; but in the Council of States the two cantons were on a footing of complete equality. The reconciliation of the two opposing parties of the civil war was so complete that one hundred years later, when the centenary of the Constitution of 1848 was celebrated, the leading members of the Federal Council, the highest executive authority in the land, came from the cantons which were defeated in the civil war.[1]

The new constitution maintained the historical continuity, but at the same time it facilitated the adaptation to changing times. Article III proclaimed that 'the Federal Constitution can be revised at any time.' Such a revision demanded the approval of the majority of the cantons and of the population. In spite of several attempts to enlarge the federal powers, the sovereign people showed itself rather conservative in upholding the constitution. A number of proposals for its revision were made in 1866; they were all rejected except for one which granted political rights to the Jews. Similarly, a general revision of the constitution was rejected on May 12, 1872. But on April 19, 1874, a large popular majority (340,199 votes to 198,013) and a small cantonal majority (13½ as against 8½) accepted a revision which has since remained in force. This revision bore a 'radical' character. It was accepted under the influence of Bismarck's unification of Germany and of his *Kulturkampf* and of the excitement created in Switzerland by the proclamation of the infallibility of the Pope. The revised constitution established the principle of freedom of conscience and of religion in all the cantons. The last traces of the validity of the sixteenth-century principle cuius regio, illius religio disappeared; the spirit of tolerance and the depolitization of religion ended the old struggle of Catholics and Protestants

[1] The British Government followed a similar policy of reconciliation towards recently defeated enemies, when it granted independence to the Boers and established the Union of South Africa, where the Boer element predominated. In this case, however, most Boers refused to follow a policy of moderation and of forming a South African nation comprising Boers, British and the educated natives, a policy which had been so promisingly sponsored by Cecil Rhodes. Instead they tried to establish, on the basis of racial and religious bigotry, a republic based on the Dutch-Calvinist element in the population.

which had threatened the existence of the Confederation for more than three centuries.[1]

[1] The constitution of 1848 prohibited in article 58 the establishment of the Jesuit Order in Switzerland. Articles 51 and 52 of the revised constitution of 1874 permitted even the suppression of other orders, 'the action of which is dangerous for the state or disturbs the peace among the religions,' and prohibited the establishment of new monasteries or religious orders. In 1948 Swiss Catholics proposed a revision of the articles excluding the Jesuits as a concession to the general religious pacification. See E. Bieri, 'Liberaler Staat und Jesuitenverbot,' and Oskar Bauhofer 'Rechtsstaat und Jesuitenverbot,' in *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, April 12 and 25, 1953.

— 19 —

SWITZERLAND IN THE AGE OF LINGUISTIC NATIONALISM

THE constitution was equally successful in preventing linguistic and ethnic struggles in the multi-lingual and multi-racial new nation. The Diet which worked out the constitution unanimously accepted on June 7, 1848, a proposition by Druey, the delegate of the Vaud, that the three main languages spoken in Switzerland—German, French and Italian—be recognized as national languages of the Confederation. No further provision was made in the constitution for the equality of the three linguistic groups. Nothing was said regarding all the questions which vexed and often destroyed other multi-lingual states in Central and Eastern Europe: equal admission to administrative offices, governmental contributions to the maintenance of schools, and linguistic rights in the courts. Nevertheless, no disputes over these questions ever seriously disturbed the peace of the Confederation. This remarkable experience in a century in which ethnic and linguistic differences led elsewhere to conflicts which played a tremendous part in the disruption of Europe, was due not only to the federal structure of Switzerland, but above all to the spirit of tolerance, restraint and good will towards minorities. All the questions were settled by practical adjustment, generally granting a privileged position to the minorities which were always represented in all branches of the federal government beyond their numerical proportion. If at any time a decision was to be taken of special interest to the Romance minorities, the German majority was always anxious not to use its preponderance and to take the feelings and sensitiveness of the other groups into account. Thus no ethnic or linguistic group felt itself threatened or frustrated in the development of its traditions and its cultural

values by more powerful and more progressive neighbours. When members of the German-speaking majority settled in the Italian-speaking Tessin or in the Romansch valleys of the Grisons, great care was taken that these members of an economically so much more powerful and dynamic group adapted themselves to their new environment and respected its character. Thus each of the various groups could regard the Swiss Confederation as the protector of its own life.[1] This could not have been the case if any of the groups had wished to change the status quo to its own profit. The numerical relationship among German, French and Italian-speaking Swiss has not been altered considerably over the last one hundred years. One of the most renowned commentators on the Federal Constitution stated the principle which constitutes the true strength of Switzerland, and which makes this multi-lingual nation an example for continental Europe: 'Every ethnic group must be certain that the other groups do not make any conquest, either officially or privately, at its expense, nor that they wish to make such conquests. To conform to this rule is the duty of Swiss loyalty; it is no less sacred because it is not written in any law. It is to be regarded as more sacred because it is one of the very foundations of our state.'[2]

German, French and Italian are widely spoken outside Switzer-

[1] 'Damit war das Problem der Nationalitätenstaaten gelöst: der gemeinsame Staat konnte von den Angehörigen jeder Sprachgruppe als ihre eigene, nach ihrem Bild geschaffene Gemeinschaft empfunden werden. . . . Die Schweiz blieb die Heimat für jeden, die Schweiz gab allen die Sicherheit, sich selbst treu bleiben zu dürfen; kein Teil des Volkes wurde zurückgesetzt, keine Sonderart ging verloren ausser durch eigenen Willen. . . . Was anderswo als Schwäche galt, ward hier zur Wurzel der Kraft. In der Erhaltung der Mannigfaltigkeit des Volkes und in der Einigung der Vielheit ohne Zwang löste die Schweiz ihre vornehmste Aufgabe, und darin lernte sie ihre Grösse sehen.' Weilenmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 225 ff. See also R. Henry, *La Suisse et la question des langues* (Berne: Stämpfli, 1906); W. E. Rappard, *Zur nationalen Verständigung und Einigkeit* (Zürich: Rascher, 1915); Paul Seippel, *Schweizerische Wahrheiten* (Zürich: Rascher, 1917); Karl Meyer, 'Die mehrsprachige Schweiz,' *Neue Schweizer Rundschau*, May 1939, pp. 17–39.

[2] Walther Burckhardt, *Kommentar der schweizerischen Bundesverfassung vom 29. Mai 1874*, 3rd ed. (Berne: Stämpfli, 1931) p. 806.

land. Their literatures have an assured existence, whatever might happen in the Confederation. But a tiny Swiss minority, about one per cent of the nation's population, speaks a language used nowhere else. In the canton of Grisons, about 67,000 inhabitants speak German, 17,000 speak Italian, and 39,000 speak Romansch. Article 46 of the cantonal constitution of 1892 recognized the three languages as official languages in the canton. Romansch is a language spoken in high Alpine valleys by hardly more than 40,000 people, who are divided among themselves by geographic separation, by strong dialectal differences and by religious allegiance. The most important dialects are the Ladino, spoken by Protestants in the Engadine on the eastern border of the canton, and the Surselva, spoken by Catholic peasants along the upper Rhine on the western border of the canton. The influx of tourists into these Alpine valleys threatened the continued existence of a vernacular which was spoken by a tiny minority and possessed almost no written literature nor any unified literary language. In the nineteenth century the language seemed doomed; its restored vitality in the twentieth century offers an interesting example of the new spirit of linguistic nationalism, and of the far-sighted policy of Switzerland.

As with so many European vernaculars, the first literary use of Romansch was made at the time of the Reformation.[1] In 1560 Giachem Bifrun published his translation of the New Testament. 'Some say,' he wrote in the introduction, 'that it is impossible to write our Romansch language, for if it were possible, our ancestors who were full of wisdom would have done it. To these I wish to reply, that it seems hardly believable that our Romansch language cannot be written, for German, French and other languages, which are more difficult than our own, can be written.' In the later part of the nineteenth century Romansch literature was modernized and secularized: textbooks and newspapers began to be published and under the influence of German and French romanticism the first poets appeared. Gichem Chasper Muoth (1844–1906), a teacher of history and Latin at the cantonal

[1] See *The Idea of Nationalism*, p. 143.

high school, wrote a number of ballads and epic poems, glorifying the love of liberty of his fellow-mountaineers. In his 'Il cumin d'Ursera' the hero, a thirteenth-century priest, calls upon the assembled peasants to remain faithful to their mother-tongue and not to yield to the advancing political and linguistic influence of the canton of Uri, then the overlord of the Romansch valley. Following his appeal, the peasants swear:

> O Romansch mother! Thou, dear mother,
> We wish to preserve thy tongue for ever.[1]

An organized nationalist activity began only at the end of the nineteenth century. In 1885 a *Societad* was founded which printed a year-book *Annalas*. Eleven years later a student association *Romania* was formed under an historical maple tree at Truns, where the first *Graue Bund* (Grey Confederation) had originated. The *Uniun dals Grieschs* in the Engadine in 1904 was the first of several similar regional associations, which all published their own literary organs. In 1919 they united in the *Ligia Romontscha*, which devoted itself to the publication of dictionaries and grammars. The reader familiar with the manifestations of modern nationalism will find in the poetry and in the articles written by this small national group, one of the smallest in numbers though not in activity or spiritual energy, all the sentiments and slogans characteristic of this movement elsewhere. Yet there is one decisive difference: the spirit of defiance of the surrounding world and of hostility toward neighbouring nationalities—sentiments which disfigure so much of modern nationalism—were absent.

In 1931 this small nationality launched a campaign for the recognition of its language as one of the national languages of Switzerland. The action 'pro quarta lingua naziunala' was supported by the canton; a national plebiscite amended article 116 of the revised constitution of 1874 on February 20, 1938, to recognize German, French, Italian and Romansch as national languages of

[1] O mumma romontscha! Ti, mumma carina,
Nus lein tia tschontsca salvar per adina!

Switzerland; for practical purposes only the first three languages continued to be used as official languages. But the Romansch language receives special consideration and support by the Confederation and by the canton.

— 20 —

SWITZERLAND AND ITS NEIGHBOURS

IN 1848 the Swiss nation received its enduring foundation; on its strength the present edifice grew up and firmly withstood several international crises. The first came in September 1856, when the monarchists in the canton of Neuchâtel, under the leadership of Count Ludwig August de Pourtalès (1796–1870) and his brother Karl Friedrich (1799–1882), tried to re-establish the position of the King of Prussia. The King supported them and mobilized part of his army to come to their help. The conflict aroused an almost unanimous patriotism throughout Switzerland, overcoming all the religious, political and linguistic divisions. The German-Swiss anthem, 'Rufst du mein Vaterland, Sieh uns mit Herz und Hand, All dir geweiht' (At your call my fatherland, see us all with heart and hand dedicated to thee), was translated into French and Italian and became the national anthem.[1] An academic legion was formed among the students and many volunteers were ready to fight. The various opposite camps were reconciled in the common patriotic enthusiasm. General Dufour again was appointed supreme commander and under him men from the former *Sonderbund* cantons mounted guard along the north-western frontier. Finally, through the good services of Napoleon III, an agreement was reached; Frederic William IV, the King of Prussia, renounced his rights to the canton and the Swiss Government released the prisoners captured during the quickly suppressed royalist uprising. The last of the eighteenth-century anomalies disappeared in Switzer-

[1] The anthem was written by Rudolf Wyss (1781–1830). The French translation began 'O monts independants'; the Italian, 'Ci chiami, o patria.' In 1856 Henri-Frederic Amiel (1821–1881) in Geneva wrote his poem 'Roulez tambours!'

land; at the same time the new union of 1848 had stood its first test.[1]

Four years later, Sardinia ceded northern Savoy to France as part of the bargain struck by Count Cavour with Napoleon III for the latter's support of Sardinia's expansion into Italy. This cession aroused a violent agitation among the Swiss radicals. They claimed that the treaties of 1815 regarding northern Savoy not only established the neutrality of this region, but something of a Swiss right to it. Jakob Stämpfli and Gottfried Keller[2] were for active intervention. Helvetia, a Swiss student organization, founded in 1832, called upon the nation to occupy northern Savoy and attacked Swiss neutrality as a bastard product of the European Restoration period. Some extremists even dreamt of northern Savoy as the Swiss gateway to the sea, as a corridor to open ports, and they demanded the creation of a Swiss merchant marine sailing the oceans as a means to develop commercial power of the nation and to provide it with opportunities for expansion, for 'The same air of liberty blows on the ocean as in the Alps.' But the large majority of the Federal Assembly under the leadership of Alfred Escher (1819–1882) of Zürich rejected all these ventures.

Many Swiss distrusted Napoleon III and the Bonapartist tradition; but after 1870 they became convinced that the Third French Republic presented no threat to the Confederation. Different was the case of Italy and Germany, two nations very recently created on the theory and on the strength of the appeal of linguistic unity. Swiss radicals approved of the German and Italian trends to unification; national unification and the unilingual nation-state seemed to belong to the progressive ideas of the century. Moreover, the radicals regarded the unification of Italy and of Germany as a victory over the very forces which they had fought in the *Sonderbund* war, over the Papacy and the clerical party, as a triumph of enlightenment and modern

[1] See Gottfried Keller's letter to the Federal Assembly, *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. XXI, p. 112.

[2] See *Sämtliche Werke*, vol. XXI, p. 127.

efficiency over Catholic conservatism. Yet while the radicals in the Italian-speaking canton of Tessin looked with undisguised sympathy on the unification of 'Italia madre antica e non mai negletta,' many Swiss recognized the danger which a centralized Italian nation-state, dreaming of greatness and power, carried for Swiss unity and integrity. Soon voices were raised in Italy claiming the Tessin and even the Grisons as belonging, by language and geography, to Italy, whose northern frontiers 'nature' had placed on the St. Gotthard and the Brenner.[1] Thus southern Switzerland was included in *Italia irredenta*. Several organizations were founded, to arouse Italian patriotism in the 'unredeemed' parts of Austria and Switzerland. World War I brought the fulfilment of Italian imperial aspirations as far as they concerned Austrian territory. The 'natural' Brenner frontier was reached; Trieste was torn away from its 'natural' Hinterland. Italian nationalism, encouraged by this gain, now turned to the redemption of *Svizzera Italiana*. In June 1921, in his first speech as a member of the Chamber of Deputies, Benito Mussolini stressed the great danger of the Germanization of the Tessin and proclaimed the St. Gotthard as the frontier demanded by Italian security. In 1926 Arrigo Solmi, professor at the University of Pavia and Italian Minister of Justice, started the publication of the *Archivio storico della Svizzera Italiana*—the title ominously recalled the *Archivio per l'Alto Adige*, which before World War I prepared the annexation of South Tyrol with historical, geo-political and ethnographical arguments. But except for a small group of Swiss who published a review *Adula* (1928–1935), calling Switzerland a German country and demanding the incorporation of its Italian- and Romansch-speaking parts into Italy, the people of the Tessin in their overwhelming majority rejected the Italian claim. They faithfully followed the decision

[1] See Marianne Bauer, *Die italienische Einigung im Spiegel der schweizerischen Oeffentlichkeit 1859–61* (Basle: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1944) and Kurt Huber, *Der italienische Irredentismus gegen die Schweiz 1870–1925* (Seengen: Fehlmann, 1953).

which they had taken of their own free will in 1798, to remain *Svizzeri e liberi.*

The unification of Germany by Bismarck found many Swiss hostile to his policy and distrusful of his intentions.[1] Some Swiss Protestants were convinced of Prussia's world-historical mission, to complete the Reformation and to establish harmony between science and faith. They shared the widespread enthusiasm prevailing in the Germany of the *Kulturkampf.* But the German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey (1833–1911), who taught in Basle from 1866 to 1868, complained to his father in a letter in the spring of 1867 how indifferent to, and doubtful of, the future greatness of Germany his colleagues were. 'Wahrhaftig, man

[1] See Hans Ulrich Rentsch, *Bismarck im Urteil der schweizerischen Presse 1862–1898* (Basle: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1945) and Eduard Vischer, 'Die deutche Reichsgründung von 1871 im Urteil schweizerischer Zeitgenossen,' *Schweizerische Zeitschrift fur Geschichte,* I (1951) Heft 3, pp. 452–484. The radical leader Augustin Keller, in opening on July 1, 1872, the Swiss Federal Council, welcomed the 'verjüngten Reichsadler Barbarossas.' In 1871 he said: 'Unter den Fittichen des neuen Reichsadlers wird die deutsche Wissenschaft ihre Römerschlachten für die Freiheit des Geistes und der Vernunft ewiges Recht schlagen, dem Vatiken aber sind die Strebeziele nach den Tagen von Canossa aus den hoffnungsvollen Blicken gerückt.' Keller, who died in 1883, witnessed Bismarck's defeat in the *Kulturkampf.* Bluntschli thanked God for the foundation of the Reich: 'Ich habe das Grösste erlebt!' He feared that Napoleon III with his army wished to execute the decrees of the Vatican Council and to renew the Papal world domination over all minds. See *Denkwürdigkeiten aus meinem Leben,* 3 vols. (Nördlingen: Beck, 1884), vol. III, pp. 268, 259. Heinrich Gelzer (1813–1889), a Swiss who was professor of history in Berlin from 1843 to 1850, took active part in 1848 in asking Prussia to establish German unity without Austria. From 1852 to 1870 he edited in his native city of Basle *Protestantische Monatsblätter für innere Zeitgeschichte* and, as a confidant of the Grand Duke of Baden, helped to bring about the Prussian unification of Germany. Bluntschli and Gelzer were equally convinced that Swiss and German history were culturally and politically inseparable.

At a banquet given in Zürich in 1872 in honour of a German professor called to Strasbourg, Gottfried Keller made some remarks which the *Basler Nachrichten* reported on March 30, 1872, as follows: 'Tell the Germans that when they will live under a constitution which will allow diversity, the time will come when the Swiss will return to Kaiser and Reich.' The newspaper added that Keller had always been known as a good republican and Swiss but that words like those attributed to him would justify the non-German Swiss in fearing the threat of Germanization. On April 1 the newspaper printed Keller's defence.

müsste das letzte Jahr in Berlin nicht gelebt haben, um solche Ideen auf etwas anderes als Unkenntnis der eigenen Zeit zurückzuführen.' (Truly, one who has lived the year of 1866 in Berlin, could explain these ideas only by ignorance of the great times in which we live.) Some Swiss became even more sceptical of Prussia's mission three years later. On September 27, 1870, Burckhardt wrote to his friend Friedrich von Preen: 'O, wie wird sich die arme deutsche Nation irren, wenn sie daheim das Gewehr in den Winkel stellen und den Künsten und dem Glück des Friedens obliegen will! Da wird es heissen: Vor allem wird weiterexerciert! und nach einiger Zeit wird niemand mehr sagen können, wozu eigentlich das Leben noch vorhanden ist.' (O, how deeply will the poor German people be mistaken when they think that they will be able to put the rifle away and to dedicate themselves to the arts and happiness of peace. They will be told: you have to carry on with your military duties! After some time nobody will be able to say why they still live.) Two years later, on April 26, 1872, he wrote to the same friend: 'Am merkwürdigsten wird es den Arbeitern gehen; ich habe eine Ahnung, die vorderhand noch völlig wie eine Torheit lautet und die mich doch durchaus nicht loslassen will: der Militärstaat muss Grossfabrikant werden. Jene Menschenanhäufungen in den grossen Werkstätten dürfen nicht in Ewigkeit ihrer Not und ihrer Gier überlassen werden; ein bestimmtes und überwachtes Mass von Misere mit Avancement und in Uniform, täglich unter Trommelwirbel begonnen und beschlossen, das ist was logisch kommen müsste.' (The strangest lot will befall the workers. I imagine that the militarized state must also become the owner and manager of large-scale industry. The masses in the huge factories cannot be left for ever to their poverty and greed. Logically there must come an order in which a certain well-controlled amount of misery will be combined with advancement and uniforms and work will start and end every day with a beating of drums.) Burckhardt's imagination saw true in the case of Prussia and of Russia, where Oswald Spengler's *Prussian*

Socialism, Ernst Jünger's *The Worker* and Stalin's bureaucratic-socialist absolutism created the new type of militarized worker. But in Switzerland, in Britain or in the United States Burckhardt's pessimism proved unfounded.[1]

The new German neighbour was judged less apocalyptically and more realistically by Segesser. The Lucerne Catholic was, like Burckhardt, a conservative representative of the old Europe, but he had a much greater experience in practical statesmanship. He saw that Bismarck's Germany would not last because it destroyed the balance of Europe and threatened her liberties. 'The German hegemony,' he wrote, 'will be of short duration. Surrounded by civilized peoples whom they can neither assimilate nor annihilate, the Germans have based their dominion on the idea of the absolute state, which threatens human liberty in its most inalienable concerns.' (Die Herrschaft der Deutschen wird von kürzerer Dauer sein, weil sie, umgeben von civilisierten Völkern, die sie weder zu assimilieren noch zu zertreten vermögen, auf die Idee des absoluten Staates fussend, die menschliche Freiheit in ihren unveräusserlichsten Gebieten bedrohen.) He believed that the creation of a powerful and centralized military state in the heart of Europe would continuously threaten the peace of Europe. 'In reality,' he wrote, 'Prussia will assimilate the whole of Germany. The superiority of Prussia's organization, the strictly ordered spirit of its people, the high intelligence of its leadership which in every branch of public life guarantees effective unity and force, will bring about the complete unification of Germany, supported by the law of attraction of Prussia's great preponderance. One may rightfully doubt whether this means a guarantee for the peace and civilization of Europe, as Count Moltke declared in the Parliament of the North German Confederation. The principle of force, upon which this new

[1] See also Burckhardt's letters to Preen of July 20, 1870, and of May 1, 1881, and to Max Alioth of November 19, 1881. See Hermann Bächtold, *Gesammelte Schriften*, ed. by Eduard Vischer (Aarau: Sauerländer, 1939), pp. 266 ff. and 300 ff., and Paul Roth, 'Licht und Schatten im Geschichtsbild Jakob Burckhardts,' *Zeitschrift für schweizerische Geschichte*, XXVII (1947), pp. 505–527.

formation in the centre of Europe has been built, cannot but go on developing according to its nature.'[1]

[1] Segesser, *Sammlung kleiner Schriften, op. cit.*, vol. I, pp. 663 and 552. In the preface (p. XI) Segesser foresaw the importance of Pan-Slavism: '... durchzittert die slavische Welt von den Gestaden des Weissen Meeres bis nach Böhmen und Croatien hinein eine spontane Bewegung, welche man als den Anfang ganz neuer Evolutionen in der Zeitgeschichte betrachten kann.' See Hans Kohn, *Pan-Slavism. Its History and Ideology* (Notre Dame University Press, 1953).

— 21 —

SWISS NATIONALISM IN THE TWO WORLD WARS

YET many German-speaking Swiss continued in their enthusiasm for the new Germany, an attitude which necessarily aroused the opposition of their French-speaking compatriots. Under General Ulrich Wille, the widely admired and overvalued model of the Prussian army exercised its influence upon the mentality of the Swiss officer corps. Many Swiss studied in Germany, many Germans taught in Switzerland. In 1902 Ferdinand Vetter, professor of German literature at Berne University, while speaking in Nuremberg at a celebration of the Germanic Museum there declared: 'We are happy to celebrate this German institution among Germans, because we German Swiss are spiritually (*dem Geiste nach*) Germans and hope to remain so.'[1] This attitude of many German Swiss was responsible for a growing antagonism between the German Swiss and the Latin-speaking Swiss; at the beginning of the twentieth century this antagonism became more important than the old religious controversies or than the division by cantonal loyalty and cantonal patriotism.[2] The war of 1914,

[1] See Hans von Greyerz, *Nation und Geschichte im bernischen Denken*, vom Beitrag Berns zum schweizerischen Geschichts- und National-bewusstsein (Berne: H. Lang, 1953), pp. 266, 319. Vetter declared: 'Eine deutsche Provinz in geistiger Beziehung also wollen wir in der deutschen Schweiz sein und bleiben, allerdings mit sehr bestimmten Reservatrechten.'

[2] A strong cantonal particularism survived only in the largest canton, Berne. Berne celebrated in 1891, simultaneously with the sixth century of the Swiss Confederation, its 700 years of historical continuity. Ulrich Dürrenmatt (1849–1908) founded in 1882 the *Bernische Volkspartei*, which stressed the local peasant and folk tradition in the spirit of Gotthelf. Otto von Greyerz (1863–1940) demanded that German in the Bernese schools should be taught on the basis of the local dialect. The Bernese cantonal parliament is the only one in which the German-speaking representatives conduct their discussions not in German, but in the local

with its split between pro-German and pro-French Swiss, aroused passions in neutral Switzerland which threatened to destroy the moral unity of the country. The Swiss Federal Council found it necessary in its appeal on October 1, 1914, to reassert 'the ideal of our country' as a cultural community and as a political idea above the diversity of race and language. 'First and above all are we Swiss, then only Latins and Germans (Zuerst und allem weit voraus sind wir Schweizer, erst in zweiter Linie Romanen und Germanen).' The greatest German poet of Switzerland after the death of Gottfried Keller, Carl Spitteler (1845–1924), raised his warning voice in an address *Unser Schweizer Standpunkt* (Our Swiss point of view), which he delivered in December 1914 before the New Helvetic Society. The ensuing debate on the meaning of Swiss neutrality did much to clarify Swiss nationalism.

Twenty years later, when World War II approached, Switzerland found herself in a strategically more precarious but intellectually more secure position than in 1914. The very essence of the nationalism then propagated in Italy and Germany aroused the opposition of Swiss federalist democracy. The new term of *geistige Landesverteidigung* (ideological national defence) was coined. The highest authorities themselves officially clarified the political idea of Switzerland. The Federal Council addressed in December 1938 a message to the nation on the meaning and mission of Switzerland, *Sinn und Sendung der Schweiz*. Its author was Federal Councillor Philipp Etter, a representative of the Catholic canton of Zug. Switzerland, the message stressed, originated around the St. Gotthard, the source of the Rhône, the Rhine and the Tessin, three rivers important for the history of the Occident. Thus this mountain pass in the heart of Europe separates and, at the same time, unites the three leading civilizations of Western history, and Switzerland is culturally linked to all three of them.

dialect. See Hans von Greyerz, *op. cit.*, pp. 251, 263, 266, 271. 'Die bernische Heimatschutzbewegung . . . ergriff in den zwanziger Jahren auch das altbernische Land. Schwierig war es, sie vor sturer Verherrlichung des "Volkes" und seines dörflichen Brauchtums zu bewahren. Schwierig war es überhaupt für betontes Bernertum, einem einseitigen und letztlich geistfeindlichen Traditionalismus auszuweichen.'

'For the very reason that we reject the concept of race or common descent as the basis of a state and as the factor determining political frontiers, we gain the liberty and the strength to remain conscious of our cultural ties with the three great civilizations. The Swiss national idea is not based upon race or biological factors, it rests on a spiritual decision.'

In a similar way, the message pointed out, the federal structure of Switzerland makes it possible for the various elements to live not only side by side but in close community. 'The Swiss federal state is an association of free republics; it does not swallow them, it federates them. The cantonal republics maintain their individuality, and thereby they are the sources and pillars of our intellectual wealth, the strongest bulwark against intellectual uniformity. Our Swiss democracy has been built up organically from the smaller units to the larger units, from the township to the canton, and from the canton to the federal state. Next to federalism and democracy, Switzerland is based upon respect for the dignity of the individual. The respect for the right and liberty of human personality is so deeply anchored in the Swiss idea, that we can regard it as its basic concept and can proclaim its defence as an essential task of the nation.' This respect for the individual and his rights guarantees the peace among the various religions and ethnic groups in Switzerland. 'We recognize the individual human personality as the strongest creative force in the life of the spirit, and the state has accordingly limited its own sphere of power.'[1]

In these words the highest Swiss authorities summed up the principles of nationalism and liberty, as they had developed in Switzerland in the last one hundred and fifty years. They did it at a time when these very principles and the whole political and intellectual structure of modern Western civilization were threatened by totalitarian collectivism, which proclaimed the precedence of the community—nation, race or class—over the individual and which knew itself as the irresistible wave of the future. In 1940 Switzerland, a lonely enclave on the Continent,

[1] See *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, December 12, 1938.

was surrounded on all sides by governments—German, French and Italian—which despised and rejected the liberal heritage. Swiss nationalism, based upon this very heritage, held out in an apparently hopeless situation as British nationalism did.[1] It had overcome ancient and bitter tensions which elsewhere provoked many hostilities; now, at a time of lowered faith and growing despair, it bore witness to the enduring steadfastness and resilience of modern Western civilization.

[1] There were some Swiss in 1940–1941 willing to compromise with the 'new European order.' About the valiant fight for the 'Swiss idea' and liberty in the period see Fred Luchsinger, *Die Neue Zürcher Zeitung im Zeitalter des zweiten Weltkrieges 1930–1955* (Zürich: Neue Zürcher Zeitung, 1955).

INDEX

Aarau, 27
Aargau, 49, 55, 86, 99
Amiel, Henri-Frederic, 120
Amiet, Jakob, 99
Asylum, Right of, 57, 70, 75, 91

Bachmann-Anderlatz, Niklaus Franz von, 56
Balthasar, Franz Urs, 26
Barth, Hans, 63, 64, 65
Basle, 23, 27, 55, 81, 82
Baumgartner, Jacob Gallus, 69
Berne, 18, 19, 23, 37, 38, 54, 55, 57, 68, 78, 99, 112, 127
Bifrun, Giachem, 117
Bismarck, Otto von, 91, 113, 123
Bluntschli, Johann Kaspar, 123
Bochat, Loys de, 26
Bodmer, Johann Jakob, 23
Bornhauser, Thomas, 68
Britain, 8, 9, 14, 15, 17, 30, 32, 33, 67, 69, 76, 83, 90, 97, 113, 125, 130
Buhl, Johann Ludwig am, 32
Burckhardt, Jakob, 81 ff., 124
Burlamazi, Jean Jacques, 15

Chambrier, Frederic de, 69
Cherbuliez, Antoine-Elisée de, 54, 67
Clemens XIV, 85
Correvon, Seigneux 26
Courvoisier, Fréderic, 106

Dilthey, Wilhelm, 123
Druey, H., 88, 115
Dufour, Guillaume-Henri, 102, 103, 105, 106, 120
Dürrenmatt, Ulrich, 127

Elgger, Franz von, 101, 102
Engels, Friedrich, 104
England *see* Britain
English Revolution, 69, 83, 84
Enlightenment, 9, 22, 25, 28 ff., 52, 68, 85, 94

Erlach, Rudolf von, 44
Escher, Alfred, 121
Etter, Philipp, 128

Fazy, James, 88
Federalism, 9, 44, 96 ff., 109 ff.
Fichte, Johann Gottlieb, 64
Flüe, Nikolaus von der, 20
France, 13, 16, 30, 42, 67
Freiligrath, Ferdinand, 104
French Revolution—
  of 1789, 13, 14, 33, 65
  of 1830, 59, 67
  of 1848, 106
Fribourg, 20, 55, 99, 105
Fröbel, Julius, 91, 92
Furrer, Jonas, 108
Füssli, Johann Heinrich, 25, 31

Gelzer, Heinrich, 123
Geneva, 19, 26, 49, 56
Germans, 15, 16, 51, 69, 81, 90, 91
Germany, 7, 50, 52, 68, 75, 82, 89, 96, 98, 106, 127
  Holy Roman Empire (until 1806), 16, 21, 34
  German Confederation (1815–1866), 57
  German Reich (1871–1918), 92, 121, 123 ff.
Glarus, 16, 56
Gotthelf, Jeremias, 78 ff., 127
Gregor XVI, 86
Greyerz, Otto von, 127
Grimmelshausen, Jakob, 21
Grisons, 19, 27, 35, 49, 55, 117, 122
Grundtvig, N. F. S., 78

Häfeli, Johann Kasper, 50
Haller, Albrecht von, 59
Haller, Karl Ludwig von, 59
Heer, Cosmus, 69
Helvetic Society, 27, 79

Häusler-Ryhiner, Andreas, 100
Hilty, Carl, 15, 39
Hirzel, Conrad Melchior, 69
Holland, 14, 52, 53, 81

Italy, 7, 35, 36, 68, 75, 97, 121, 122

Jaspers, Karl, 13
Jesuits, 85 ff., 114

Keller, Augustin, 87, 123
Keller, Gottfried, 87, 89 ff., 121, 123
Kinkel, Gottfried, 82
Knesebeck, Karl Friedrich von, 53

Laharpe, Amadée de, 37
Laharpe, Frederic César de, 37, 39, 47
Leu, Joseph, 86
Liberty, Concept of, 9, 13, 15, 17, 23, 32, 65, 88, 94
List, Friedrich, 57
Lombardy *see* Italy
Lucerne, 18, 23, 26, 86, 87, 99

Mazzini, Giuseppe, 69, 75, 76
Meyer, Bernhard, 102
Michelet, Jules, 104
Monnard, Charles, 70, 72
Müller, Johannes, 28 ff., 70, 90
Münch, Ernst Hermann Joseph, 89
Muoth, Gichem Chasper, 117
Muralt, Beat Ludwig von, 23
Mussolini, Benito, 122

Napoleon I, 33 ff., 48 ff., 65
Napoleon III, 120, 121
Neuchâtel, 49, 56, 106, 120
Neuhaus, Karl, 100
Neutrality, 21, 56, 76, 88
Niebuhr, Barthold Georg, 52

Ochs, Peter, 39
Ochsenbein, Ulrich, 68, 106
Oken, Lorenz, 52

Jean Paul *see* Richter, Jean Paul
Peel, Robert, 103
Pestalozzi, Johann Heinrich, 28, 45, 61 ff., 74
Pfyffer, Eduard, 69, 70
Piaget, Alexis Marie, 106
Pius VIII, 86
Planta, Peter Konradin von, 105
Plato, 63
Poland, 68, 69, 75
Pourtalès, Karl Friedrich de, 120
Pourtalès, Ludwig August de, 120
Prussia, 52, 53, 69, 92, 125

Quinet, Edgar, 104

Railroads, 107
Rappard, William E., 54, 58, 108
Reformation, 21, 105
Reinhard, Hans von, 50
Rengger, Albrecht, 42
Richter, Jean Paul, 51
Rochemont, Charles Pictet de, 57
Romansch Language, 117, 118
Rossi, Pellegrino, 70
Rousseau, Jean Jacques, 26, 46, 49, 63, 79
Ruchat, Abraham, 26
Russia, 37, 75, 97
Rüttimann, J. J., 108, 112

St. Gallen, 49, 102
Salis-Soglio, Johann Ulrich von, 103
Salis, Ulysses von, 27
Sardinia, 69, 88, 121
Savoy, 19, 121
Schiller, Friedrich von, 90
Schinznach, 27
Schweizer, Jakob, 43
Schwyz, 18, 55, 99
Segesser, Philip Anton von, 100, 101, 110, 125
Sidler, Georg Josef, 109
Siegwart-Müller, Constantin, 86, 102
Slavs, 126
Snell, Ludwig, 91
Snell, Wilhelm, 91
Solmi, Arrigo, 122
Solothurn, 20, 55

Sonderbund, 99 ff., 120
Spengler, Oswald, 124
Spitteler, Carl, 128
Springer, Julius, 80
Staël, Madame de, 39
Stäfa, 31
Stämpfli, Jakob, 68, 88, 121
Stapfer, Philippe Albert, 45
Steiger, Jakob Robert, 87
Steiger, Niklaus Friedrich von, 38

Tell, Wilhelm, 24, 26, 29, 104, 105
Tessin, 19, 26, 36, 47, 88, 116, 122
Thurgau, 49, 68, 76
Troxler, Ignaz Paul Vital, 111
Tscharner, Johann Karl von, 90
Tschudi, Aegidius, 16

Ulrich, Joseph Balthasar, 103
United States of America, 8, 9, 38, 69, 80, 90, 94, 97, 111, 125
Unterwalden, 18, 20, 99
Uri, 18, 23, 55, 99, 112, 118
Usteri, Paul, 41, 42

Valais, 19, 49, 56, 99
Val Tellina, 35, 55
Vattel, Emeric de, 15
Vaud, 19, 20, 26, 37, 49, 55, 115
Vetter, Ferdinand, 127

Waser, Johann Heinrich, 30
Weilenmann, Hermann, 14, 22, 47, 116
Wille, Ulrich, 127
Wyss, Rudolf, 120

Zimmerman, Joseph Ignaz, 24
Zschokke, Heinrich, 27, 45, 72 ff.
Zug, 99, 128
Zürich, 18, 19, 23, 25, 31, 32, 49, 52, 55, 68, 92, 99

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD
London: 40 Museum Street, W.C.1

Auckland: 24 Wyndham Street
Bombay: 15 Graham Road, Ballard Estate, Bombay 1
Calcutta: 17 Chittaranjan Avenue, Calcutta 13
Cape Town: 109 Long Street
Karachi: Haroon Chambers, South Napier Road, Karachi 2
New Delhi: 13–14 Ajmeri Gate Extension, New Delhi 1
São Paulo: Avenida 9 de Julho 1138–Ap. 51
Sydney, N.S.W.: Bradbury House, 55 York Street
Toronto: 91 Wellington Street West

A HISTORY OF SWITZERLAND
Professor Charles Gilliard

In Switzerland people of three races, two religions and four languages live peaceably side by side. The evolution of this model pacifist Confederation is a story of extraordinary fascination and is told, in this concise history, in a way admirably suited for the general reader.

Beginning with the traditional story of Tell and Gessler, it traces the growth of the Swiss Republic from the first nucleus of cantons which successfully opposed the Hapsburgs, through the gradual liberation of other cantons; the repercussions of the French Revolution; the influence of Napoleon; and the drafting of the present Constitution. A final chapter brings the story of constitutional change up to date.

The author gives a lucid and straightforward account of the Republic with the emphasis on the constitutional development rather than on battles and national figures. He successfully conveys the reasons why this tiny country is in very many respects envied by her larger and more powerful neighbours.

5 maps. Cr. 8vo. 8s. 6d. net

SWITZERLAND: LIFE AND ACTIVITY
Edited by Ernest Schürch

How is it possible for a small country with almost no natural resources to have an exceptionally high standard of living? How can a nation with four different languages and several religions live in internal harmony? How can such a country entirely surrounded by great powers stay out of their quarrels? Switzerland, a little republic in the heart of the world's most troubled area, has found a practical answer to questions vital to human preservation everywhere.

Thinking people the world over realize that it must take more than the Alps and a watch industry to build such a civilization. This extraordinary book attempts to discover the secret. It was planned and published by Werner Reist. The subject matter was written by twenty-seven prominent authors, each an expert in his field.

La. Cr. 8vo. 15s. net

SWISS NEUTRALITY
Edgar Bonjour

'A timely book and one that should go a long way to dispel the misconceptions which exist as to the real meaning of Switzerland's neutrality. . . . A word of praise is due to the translator, the rendering is flawless. . . . Brilliantly written, never laboured.'—*Swiss Observer*

Cr. 8vo. *Second Edition.* 9s. 6d. net

GERMAN HISTORY: SOME NEW GERMAN VIEWS
Edited by Hans Kohn

'A symposium which will interest not only students but the wider public which has learned at the cost of two world wars that the fortunes of the virile German race affect the lives of us all in the closest way. . . . Frank and thoughtful.'—*Times Educational Supplement*

'In compiling this interesting, revealing, and often depressing volume Professor Kohn has performed a useful and timely service.'—*Manchester Guardian*

Demy 8vo. 18s. net

WESTERN GERMANY FROM DEFEAT TO REARMAMENT
Alfred Grosser

Translated by Sir Richard Rees

'Written with an understanding and sympathy not displayed by all his colleagues of the French Press. Sincere and restrained and because it is honestly informative—with figures but not too many of them, character studies of the leading men in the Federal Republic, and an impartial viewpoint on every German problem of importance—this book will be of value to the English reader.'—*Manchester Guardian*

'M. Grosser is scrupulously fair, experienced and erudite. His book is well written (and well translated).'—*Time and Tide*

Demy 8vo. 18s. net

WORLD INDIVISIBLE
Konrad Adenauer

This is an inspiring book, as well as an important one. Dr. Adenauer's vision of Europe and of the world of tomorrow, and the means by which his objectives can be attained, is the best answer to cynical and materialistic criticisms of human affairs. In this book we see Adenauer the diplomat, the politician, the thinker—and also the dedicated humanitarian. It is a rich treasury of a great man's wisdom.

Cr. 8vo. 10s. 6d. net

GEORGE ALLEN & UNWIN LTD